

THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW

BOARD OF EDITORS

FRANCIS A. CHRISTIE
WILLIAM E. DODD
SIDNEY B. FAY

GUY S. FORD
EVARTS B. GREENE
J. FRANKLIN JAMESON

MANAGING EDITOR

J. FRANKLIN JAMESON

VOLUME XXX

OCTOBER 1925 TO JULY 1926

NEW YORK
THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
LONDON: MACMILLAN AND CO., LTD.

1926

LANCASTER PRESS, INC.
LANCASTER, PA.

R.
0.1
Amsh
1.31

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XXXI

NUMBER 1. OCTOBER, 1925

ARTICLES

MARCHESA NICCOLINI	A Medieval Florentine, his Family and his Possessions	I
CLAUDE H. VAN TYNE	French Aid before the Alliance of 1778	20
PAUL H. BUCK	The Poor Whites of the Ante-Bel- lum South	41
WILLIAM L. LANGER	The European Powers and the French Occupation of Tunis, 1878-1881, I.	55
NOTES AND SUGGESTIONS—The Name "United States of America"		79
DOCUMENTS—The Change of Secession Sentiment in Virginia in 1861, contributed by James E. Walms- ley		82
REVIEWS OF BOOKS		102
HISTORICAL NEWS		185

NUMBER 2. JANUARY, 1926

ARTICLES

CHARLES M. ANDREWS	The American Revolution: an In- terpretation	219
FRANK B. MARSH	Roman Parties in the Reign of Tiberius	233
WILLIAM L. LANGER	The European Powers and the French Occupation of Tunis, 1878-1881, II.	251
ROY F. NICHOLS	United States vs. Jefferson Davis	266
DOCUMENTS—Despatches of Castelnau de la Mauvissière (on Frobisher, Gilbert, de la Roche, Drake), 1577-1581		285
REVIEWS OF BOOKS		297
COMMUNICATION		371
HISTORICAL NEWS		373

NUMBER 3. APRIL, 1926

ARTICLES

	The Meeting of the American His- torical Association at Ann Arbor	415
RICHARD B. MORRIS	Massachusetts and the Common Law: the Declaration of 1646	443
JOHN W. WRIGHT	The Corps of Light Infantry in the Continental Army	454
FRANK A. GOLDER	Russian-American Relations during the Crimean War	462

iii

19953

DOCUMENTS—A Confederate Private at Fort Donelson, 1862, contributed by Walter F. Meier; Three Man- uscripts of Gideon Welles, con- tributed by A. Howard Meneely	477
REVIEWS OF BOOKS	495
COMMUNICATIONS	598
HISTORICAL NEWS	600

NUMBER 4. JULY, 1926

ARTICLES

CONYERS READ	Good Queen Bess	647
VERA L. BROWN	The South Sea Company and Con- traband Trade	662
E. MALCOLM CARROLL	French Public Opinion on War with Prussia in 1870	679
NATHANIEL W. STEPHENSON	Calhoun, 1812, and After	701
G. M. STEPHENSON	Background of the Beginnings of Swedish Immigration, 1850-1875	708
NOTES AND SUGGESTIONS—Note on the Samuel Johnson Papers; The International Committee of His- torical Sciences		724
DOCUMENTS—Commerce between France and the United States, 1783-1784, contributed by Henri Sée		732
REVIEWS OF BOOKS		753
COMMUNICATIONS		847
HISTORICAL NEWS		850
INDEX		892

The
American Historical Review

A MEDIEVAL FLORENTINE, HIS FAMILY AND HIS
POSSESSIONS

L APO NICCOLINI, born in 1356, was a notable example of the versatility of the medieval Florentine. He was a statesman, a successful merchant, a student of the ancient manuscripts belonging to the state, and a country squire who managed his own property.

He wrote two books¹ in which he kept a record of his private concerns, and from these papers we learn many details about his private life. It is evident that he managed all his affairs in town and country himself without the help of any agent. He belonged to the "Arte della Lana", or Wool Gild, and his commerce prospered, but he found plenty of time to give to other business matters and to the management of his farms. He chronicled all the principal events in his family life, he registered the ceremonies of his two marriages and placed upon record the dates of his children's births and baptisms and other circumstances of their lives.

He married his first wife Ermelina in 1384.² She was a daughter of "Messer Zanobi son of Giovanni di Cione da Mezola, an honorable knight",³ and her dowry was 700 gold florins. The marriage was arranged on March 10, 1383, but it was not till March 27, 1384, that they were betrothed. Betrothal was a solemn ceremony of Longobard origin and it nearly always took place in a church. The bride and bridegroom plighted their troth and sealed the agreement with a kiss on their lips. Lapo wrote that he and his brother Filippo were betrothed on the same day in the church of St. Stephen at the bridge. Filippo married Giletta, daughter of Franceschino Spini. The last part of the marriage ceremony was deferred until May 10, when Lapo gave Ermelina the ring in the house of Messer Zanobi,

¹ One of these books is in the archives of the Niccolini family and the other is in the state archives under the heading of "Stroziana", 2^a serie 6.

² R. Archivio di Stato, Stroziana, 2^a serie 6, carta XII.

³ Knighthood was considered a great dignity in Florence in the fourteenth century and it carried with it many privileges.

which was at "the corner of Via Maggio". Lapo wrote: "next day, on May 11, I Lapo, and Filippo my brother, together took the women as our wives and we had a feast in our house in Via del Palagio."⁴ On May 15 the dowry of Lapo's wife was paid by Ermelina's brother in Messer Zanobi's name, but Lapo only received 610 gold florins in cash, though he gave a receipt for 700 gold florins. The remaining gold florins were represented by the value of the bride's "gifts and things". However, Lapo declared that he was content and the contract was drawn up by the notary Francesco Dallinari. Seven children were born of the union, five sons and two daughters, and Lapo records their births and baptisms and the names of their godfathers; they had no godmothers.

Ermelina died on February 29, 1399 (leap year),⁵ and she was buried next day on March 1, a Monday. "May God in his pity and mercy have given her a generous pardon", wrote her husband after recording her decease.

Lapo married a second wife on Thursday, August 4, 1401.⁶ She was Caterina, daughter of the late Biagio, son of Messer Giovanni, a Milanese, and she was the widow of Antonio, son of Messer Rinaldo de' Gianfigliuzzi. This time the ceremonies were all curtailed. They were betrothed in the church of Santa Maria Sopraporta and then "immediately afterwards", wrote Lapo, "I gave her the ring in the house of her brother in the Terma,⁷ . . . so that one may say that I plighted my troth and gave her the ring at the same time. She is to have a thousand gold florins" (as her dowry). Lapo did not take her home till September 11, when she went to his house in Via del Palagio del Podestà.

Lapo had six children by his second wife, five sons and one daughter. One of his sons by his first wife died in infancy, but in 1413, when his youngest child was born, he had twelve children living.

Lena, Lapo's eldest daughter, was the first of the family to marry. She was betrothed when she was seventeen to Ugo degli Altoviti in the church of Or San Michele on Saturday, May 5, 1405. Lapo gave his daughter a dowry of 700 gold florins; 600 of this was to be paid in cash and the rest was to be represented by her trousseau

⁴ Now Via Ghibellina. The house belonged to both brothers and was valued at 700 florins when they inherited it from their father.

⁵ According to the practice which the Florentines followed till 1750, the year 1400 would not be counted as beginning until the day which we call Mar. 25, 1400.

⁶ R. Archivio di Stato, Stroziana, 2^a serie 6, carta XXX.

⁷ Now Via delle Terme.

and jewels; he gave his daughter "a set of pearl buttons, a pearl cap, shirts and other things" valued at 100 florins.⁸

On Sunday, May 17, Ugo sent his betrothed the coffer with his presents in it, and he gave her the ring the same day. The dowry was not given by Lapo till June 13, and Lena remained in her father's house till June 14, when Lapo wrote "I sent her [Lena] to her husband the said Ugo on June 14 to Ugo's house in Borgo Santo Apostolo" and he wished the couple a peaceful, honorable, and long life. His wishes were not realized, for Ugo died after eleven years of married life and Lena followed her husband to the grave little more than a year later. She passed away on Tuesday, July 25, 1418, on the day of St. Anna between the sixth and the seventh hour.

According to the desire of the "Ufficiali de Pupilli", a fourteenth-century court of chancery, Lapo took their three little girls, Ermelina, Mea, and Cosa, to live in his house, and he was to give them lodging, food, drink, and clothing for a fixed sum. There is, however, a blank space in Lapo's book where the sum was to have been registered.

Lapo bought some of his deceased son-in-law's household possessions from the executors, probably for the use of his grandchildren. He made the following list of his purchases: "A coverlet and two feather cushions; the cover was of 'lanella' nearly rotten and in sorry condition, but the feathers were very good. A white coverlet and a little coverlet for a couch bed." They were valued on Lapo's behalf by a certain Andrea di Damiano at thirty florins "di soldi" and Bernaba, the little girls' agent, brought three dealers in second-hand goods to see them, who also gave them exactly the same value. Lapo bought at the same time from the heirs of his cousin Francesco Niccolini

A low bed with two little drawers at the foot about one cubit⁹ high, a coverlet with two feather cushions, a mattress, a straw mattress in sorry condition, a servant's bed cover, the whole valued by Andrea at 24 gold florins altogether, and two coverlets in sorry condition, the two together valued at six gold florins . . . so that the inheritance, or rather Niccolao di Francesco, is to have in all thirty gold florins; the said Andrea valued the said things on March 20, 1417.

At the same time Lapo bought "some shelves or rather a little cupboard with four shelves" which had belonged to his son-in-law and which he put in his study behind his bedroom. He also bought a pair of little andirons, a chain for the fireplace, one pair of tongs,

⁸ Stroziana, 2^a serie 6, carta XXXVI.

⁹ The word in Italian is "braccio", equivalent to a cubit. The measure is still in use.

two forks, a fire shovel, also two pails; all these things cost two gold florins.¹⁰

Niccolaio, Lapo's eldest son, was thirty years old in 1416, and Lapo wished him to marry. With a view to making Niccolaio independent, Lapo proposed to give Niccolaio a share of his property and three arbitrators were named to decide on the amount he was to have. This deed of gift was not carried into effect at the time, "because", Lapo wrote, "our intentions could not be fulfilled".¹¹ Niccolaio, however, must have received his share of the patrimony shortly afterwards, for, when he died the following year, he had evidently been in possession of his property, as the following entry written by Lapo proves:¹²

The all powerful God called the soul of Niccolaio my son to himself on the day of Madonna Santa Lucia the thirteenth of December, 1417. May God have given his soul a generous pardon with his benediction—he had mine. Niccolaio was born on the twenty-ninth day of March, 1396, so he lived in the world 31 years, 8 months, and 14 days. He had neither wife nor children and he made no will though he was emancipated from me,¹³ because he had nothing of his own and he had dissipated and wasted more of my substance than was lawfully his. I have written down in certain books of mine a part of what he wasted. He was very intelligent and "virtuoso"¹⁴ in no small degree, but he was too great a spendthrift of his own and others' money. He cared for nothing but the gratification of his desires and his wishes, and he gave me a great deal of trouble while he lived in this miserable world.

After Niccolaio's death, Lapo's hopes were centred in his eldest surviving son, and it is evident that it was the custom to give a larger portion to the eldest son than to the others. Lapo wrote:¹⁵

I made a deed of arrangement with Giovanni my son on the seventh of November, 1418. . . . My reason for making the settlement was that, Giovanni being about 26 years of age, I wanted to give him a wife. My family being very large, I decided to separate from him and to give him his rightful share of my property and much more as well. This I did because he was the eldest of my surviving sons. The deed was drawn up by Ser Antonio, a Florentine notary.

Lapo's wishes were carried out; Giovanni married Tita degli Albizzi. He died in 1463, leaving no sons.

¹⁰ Stroziana, 2^a serie 6, carta LXI., tergo.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, carta LVII., tergo.

¹² *Ibid.*, carta LX.

¹³ *Emancipazione* was the legal act by which a father set his son free from the *patria potestà*.

¹⁴ It is obvious that the word *virtuoso* can not be translated by its English equivalent, "virtuous", so I have given the Italian word.

¹⁵ Stroziana, 2^a serie 6, carta LXVI.

Biagio, Lapo's second surviving son, studied law in Bologna and he too was emancipated during his father's lifetime. There is a record of the linen given to Biagio when he set up house by himself and also of his share of his father's property in farms and houses.

The third surviving son entered the order of San Giovanni Gualberto and became abbot of the monastery of San Salvi. The second daughter, Giovanna, married Giovanni degli Albizzi and forged another link between the two families, already closely united by political interests. Batista, Lapo's youngest son by his second marriage, predeceased him, but the other four took their share in the government of the republic. Ottobuono, the youngest, called Messer Otto by his contemporaries, played an important part in the political life of the time. He became famous as a lawyer before he took office in the state, and after being *gonfaloniere* in 1458 he was sent on numerous embassies, to four popes in succession, to the Emperor Frederick III., to the king of Naples, and to the republic of Siena. He was given the title of count palatine by Pope Nicholas V.; he was made a knight by Pope Pius II., who also gave him the privilege of quartering the papal tiara and keys on his arms.

Lapo kept an account in his books of the rental paid for his shops and houses in Florence, recording also the terms of his contracts with his peasants in the country, and one of his records throws a light on his domestic arrangements. A shop in one of his houses was let to two barbers named Lucha and Goro, at a rent of six gold florins a year for two years, from September 6, 1421, till September 5, 1423. "This house", Lapo writes, "had originally belonged to Biagio Niccolini, my grandfather's brother, and then to Monna Guida, my cousin. She left it to Santa Maria Nuova¹⁶ with certain conditions and I bought it back according to those conditions."

The barbers at that time kept public baths, and Lucha and Goro paid Lapo ten lire for a *catasta*¹⁷ of his wood, which was brought to Florence by Lapo's mules and by his servant. The wood was evidently used for heating the water. The public baths were still frequented by respectable people and had not yet fallen into disrepute. Lapo was shaved by his tenants, and he and his family frequented the baths, which were in the house adjoining his own. He wrote that he paid "according to our agreement three gold florins and nineteen soldi" to Lucha and Goro "for shaving and cutting my

¹⁶ The principal hospital in Florence, founded by Folco Portinari.

¹⁷ When wood is cut and prepared for fuel, it is arranged in blocks called "cataste". Each "catasta" is six *braccia* long, two high, and two wide; a *braccio* is about 23 inches.

hair and cutting the children's hair, and for washing us until November the first, 1423". He also paid an old debt of his granduncle's at the same time: "I gave them fourteen *lire di piccioli* for four years' of washing that they had done and for seventeen months that they said that they had washed Messer Biagio".¹⁸

Lapo was esteemed and beloved in Florence.¹⁹ He seems to have been of a generous nature, and he was always ready to be of service to his friends. He wrote a list of his loans²⁰ and we see that his horse, his armor, his hat, his jewels, and even his money were all at their disposal. "I lent Maso, son of Mariano degli Albizzi, my hat with the pearls and my sword and a silver belt for wearing in the 'Signoria' when he was elected to go to Città di Castello as Podestà. He gave me back the said hat and sword because he did not go, and then he refused." This was in 1409.

Lapo lent his bay charger (for which he had paid 42½ gold florins), with the saddle, to Maso da Terni and his cuirass²¹ of steel, which weighed about 37 pounds and cost 20 florins, to Piero di Giovanni Fiorenza, who duly returned it. Another friend, Alamanno Salviati, to whom he subsequently lent the cuirass, ill requited his kindness. Instead of returning the cuirass he tried to change it and gave back an iron one in its place. Luckily Lapo at once saw the substitution and obliged Alamanno to return the true cuirass and the loan was cancelled. Lapo also guaranteed a loan of five hundred gold florins to Giovanni di Barbadori "and this", he wrote, "I did without any gain, but simply for love".

¹⁸ In the Niccolini volume, carta 46.

¹⁹ Eugenio Gamurrini, *Istoria Genealogica delle Famiglie Nobili Toscane et Umbre* (Florence, 1668-1685), I. 513.

²⁰ In the Niccolini volume, carta 10.

²¹ In the original manuscript the word is "pantiera". Baron de Cosson, an authority on old armor, gives the following explanation of the word: "Pantiera is certainly a Florentine and old-fashioned form of the word *panciera* or *panziera*, which, derived from *pancia*, means that piece of defensive armor which covered the lower part of the abdomen: in French *pansière* and in English *placcate*." But the interesting part of the document is that both the weight and the price of Lapo's *pantiera* convince me that he used the word as meaning much more than a simple *panziera* or *placcate*. Indeed, my *vocabulario* has: "*Panziera*, termine storico militare non commune, *Corazza*." In that case, as often happens, the part is used for the whole. I think there can be no doubt that Lapo Niccolini used the word *pantiera* for his complete cuirass, perhaps even for his whole defensive armament of steel. The great weight, 37 Florentine pounds, which I take it would be about 12 kilos, far exceeds the weight of any single *placcate*; so also the cost, 20 florins, is far above the value of a single plate of armor. In the inventory drawn up in 1492, after the death of Lorenzo il Magnifico, we find a suit of steel jousting armor of Piero de' Medici, consisting of "elmetto, spalacci, corazza, bracciali, schinieri, et arnesi", valued at 20 florins, just what Lapo paid for his *pantiera*.

Lapo's political life began in 1389, when he was a *priore*, a member of the government, for the first time. Before Lapo and his colleagues took office the government had been in the hands of the Arti Minori.²² The yoke of these plebeian rulers had proved a heavy one. The democratic government employed cruel measures to keep in power. Many of those who opposed them and who belonged to the great families were condemned to death or exiled on trivial grounds. The laws were no longer respected, trade declined, and want prevailed in the city. There was constant dissatisfaction, a reaction came, and a successful rising caused a change in the state in favor of the citizens who belonged to the Arti Maggiori and who from this time formed an oligarchy in the state.

The ruling spirit of the small band of men who kept the supreme power in their hands for many years was Maso degli Albizzi. He and his supporters, among whom was Lapo Niccolini,²³ successfully steered the republic through difficult times. They brought two wars to a satisfactory end, they kept their chief enemy, Visconti, in check, they greatly enlarged the boundaries of their country, and they gradually restored tranquillity and prosperity in the state. Lapo attained the highest office in the government: he was *gonfaloniere* for the first time in 1401, when he was able to persuade the Emperor Rupert to join the alliance against Gian Galeazzo Visconti. During his second term of office as *gonfaloniere* in 1405, he employed every means in his power to bring the war for the possession of Pisa to a successful conclusion,²⁴ and when he left office he was named one of the *dieci di balie*, a board of ten citizens who were charged with carrying on the war. When Pisa was taken by the Florentines, he had the privilege of entering the city in triumph beside Gino Capponi, who had treated with the Pisans for the surrender of their city. They returned to Florence amid great rejoicings, and Gino carried with him the manuscript of the Emperor Justinian's Pandects, which the Florentines wrongly supposed to be the only copy of the code in existence. The Florentines set great store by the possession of this celebrated document and considered it the greatest prize of their victory.

The conquest of Pisa and Porto Pisano brought great advantages to the Florentine traders, and the possession of Porto Pisano prob-

²² The lesser arts or gilds. Lapo belonged to the Arti Maggiori or greater gilds.

²³ F. T. Perrens, *Histoire de Florence* (Paris, 1877-1883), VI. 4, 206; Gino Capponi, *Storia della Repubblica di Firenze* (Florence, 1876), II. 150; Gamurrini, *op. cit.*, I. 513.

²⁴ Scipione Ammirato, *Istorie Fiorentine* (Florence, 1848), IV. 158.

ably inspired the Florentines with the ambition to make their country a sea power. They began to build a fleet which was to carry their wares abroad to avoid the necessity of sending them by foreign ships. They felt, however, that there was no security for their galleys as long as Leghorn was held by the Genoese, and they offered to buy that important harbor from Genoa. The Genoese haggled about the price for two years, but at last they came to terms, when Lapo was head of the state for the fourth time. He and his colleagues successfully concluded a bargain with the Genoese government, and Leghorn became a Florentine possession for the sum of a hundred thousand gold florins. The contract was signed in Lapo's presence on June 30, 1421.²⁵

He was *gonfaloniere* for the fifth and last time in 1425.²⁶ He was named successively governor of Arezzo, Pistoia, and Volterra and he was sent on several embassies, of which one was to Siena in 1409, when the Florentines feared the invasion of King Ladislas's army.²⁷

Lapo died in 1430 while he was governor (*vicario*) of the castle of Vico Pisano, and his son Paolo thus records his death and burial: ²⁸

Almighty God called to himself the blessed soul of Lapo, my father, son of Giovanni Niccolini. May God of his pity and mercy have given his soul true pardon, and this was on the twenty-fourth of December, 1430, at the tenth hour, in the castle of Vico Pisano, of which he was governor, and he left seven sons and a daughter. . . . And we had the body of the said Lapo brought from Vico Pisano to Florence in a sealed coffin on the twenty-sixth of December, 1430, and we deposited the said coffin in San Jacopo tra le Fosse on the same day at the hour of vespers. And then we had him buried on the twenty-seventh of December in the evening in the Church of Santa Croce of Florence in the tomb of Giovanni, his father, at the foot of the high altar, where the others of our family are buried, and the marble slab is there with the name of the said Giovanni inscribed on it and our arms are in the middle. . . . And then on the fourth of January we celebrated the funeral service and the commemoration of the said Lapo my father, as it was our duty and according to our wish, because he had been a man of great worth and much honored in all the principal offices of our country both at home and abroad. Though it was a very unpleasant time of war and pestilence, and though we had the heaviest taxes and little substance, we considered his honor and ours above our interest as good sons should do. We spent a great deal, as appears in the book of the heirs of the said Lapo, written by the hand of Bernardo Niccolini.

²⁵ Gamurrini, *op. cit.*, I. 513.

²⁶ Priorista di Palazzo, R. Archivio di Stato.

²⁷ Passerini, *Genealogia e Storia della Famiglia Niccolini* (Florence, 1870).

²⁸ "La Morte di Lapo"; from a book of records written by Paolo Niccolini his son.

Moreover, Lapo had (at his funeral) three horses covered with three banners. One was the banner of the representative of Vico Pisano, the second was Lapo's banner with his arms on it, and the other was the banner of the city of Pistoia, for he was given the arms of that city when he was *podestà* there. Then he had a file of men carrying flags with his arms on them and files with flags of the Arte della Lana and of the traders, and moreover he had on a horse the banner with the miniver's back, which is called the banner of the Merchantante.²⁹ He had also the clergy and the canons and all the orders of Florence. It was a great expense and we four younger sons, Paolo, Lorenzo, Bernardo, and Otto, paid everything, also the expenses of the vigil when we had the corpse brought here and that of the masses which were said on January 5, the day after the commemoration. For all these things may God be praised and thanked, because I spent my fourth part with good-will and so I hope did the other three.

As we have seen, Lapo kept a record of the terms on which he rented his houses and shops in Florence to Lucha and Goro and other tenants; he also kept a full account of his dealings with his peasants.

Many closely written pages are devoted to his compacts, or *patti*, with his tenants. He kept a register of his farms and wrote out the terms on which he granted his land to his peasants, and whenever a new tenant was installed he either made a fresh copy of the compact or added new clauses to the old one. Lapo, like many of his contemporaries, evidently took the keenest interest in country life. In the fourteenth century, according to Villani, every citizen among the *popolani* and *grandi* either had built or was building a large and splendid mansion in the country. He describes those near Florence as costly dwellings and beautiful buildings, much finer than those in the city. Further from the city there were other "magnificent palaces, with towers, courts, and walled gardens".³⁰ Another writer in the following century thus writes of the country houses near Florence: "Many of these buildings are like seigneurs' palaces, and many have the form of fortresses, of castles, superb and sumptuous edifices."³¹

Lapo possessed a country house near Florence. He was "emancipated" by his father, Giovanni, in the year 1368, when Giovanni gave him a place at Galuzzo. The property was called "the Champora or rather the Romituza", and on it there was a

²⁹ Another name for the "Arte di Calimala", a guild which imported foreign cloth in a raw state to be dyed, shorn, and dressed in Florence.

³⁰ Giovanni Villani, *Croniche*, I. XI., c. 94.

³¹ Agnolo Pandolfini [L. B. Alberti], *Trattato del Governo della Famiglia*, ed. G. Finzi (Turin, 1878), p. 38.

house for the "Signori"³² and a farm-house. There was a garden too, and a vineyard and some arable land. The property consisted of two parts: one part of the estate was according to Lapo about 72 *staiera* in extent, while "opposite the garden" was another bit of land of the size of 13 *staiera*, consisting in part of arable land and in part of a vineyard.³³ Giovanni paid 775 gold florins for the whole property, but the contract was made out for only 700 golden florins. "This we did", Lapo confesses, "in order to pay a lower tax." When Giovanni died in 1381, Lapo inherited some more land, namely, a farm called Santa Cristina situated in Val di Pesa, a place that Giovanni had bought from Bindo Buondelmonte, and another "little farm" in Val di Pesa called Paterno. Lapo was constantly adding to his possessions, and bought many pieces of land. Some of these had houses or towers on them and some were farms with peasants' houses. We read that the husbandmen were provided with many conveniences. There were threshing-floors, kitchen gardens, pigeon-houses, wells, barns, olive-oil mills, ovens for baking, and walled courtyards. The smaller properties were described as bits of arable land, vineyards, or woods.

Lapo granted his land to the peasants on the condition that they should give him half the produce of the farm, and no rent was paid in money. The origin of the well-known system of agricultural partnership familiar in Italy under the name of *mezzeria* can be traced to early Roman times when a similar compact existed between land-owner and husbandmen.³⁴ It appears to have fallen into disuse during the Empire, for we find Pliny the Younger advocating the *mezzeria* as a remedy for the deterioration of husbandry.³⁵

During the centuries which followed the fall of the Empire, the northern invaders established the feudal system in Italy; the system, however, was modified to some extent by the customs of the conquered race, who adhered to the traditions of their Roman forefathers.³⁶

The twelfth and thirteenth centuries saw the rise of the republics in Tuscany and the gradual dissolution of the feudal system. It was

³² This country house still exists. It was sold by the Niccolini's in the fifteenth century and was successively in the possession of many Florentine families among whom were the Guicciardini's, Sacchetti's, and Altoviti's. It was restored in the eighteenth century.

³³ Professor Vittorio Raca estimates that 72 *staiera* were probably equal to 14 hectares = 34.6 acres.

³⁴ A. Rabbeno, *Manuale Pratico della Mezzeria* (Milan, 1895).

³⁵ Pliny the Younger, *Epist.*, l. IX., ep. 37.

³⁶ Pietro Capei, "Origine della Mezzeria in Toscana", in *Biblioteca dell'Economista*, second ser., vol. II.

the policy of the republics to diminish the strength and prestige of the feudal lords, and they employed every means in their power to loosen the tie that bound the vassal or serf to his superior.³⁷ The feudal lords themselves gradually granted a greater degree of freedom to their bondsmen³⁸ and several classes of countrymen existed who had a certain amount of liberty. These dependents consisted of *fideles*, *villani* or *coloni*, and the *servi* or serfs. The two first, the *fideles* and *coloni*, might have been called freemen had they not shared with the serfs the disability of being bound to the land. Early in the thirteenth century properties were still sold with the husbandmen on them and *fideles*, *villani*, and serfs were disposed of at their masters' will and pleasure.³⁹

A law was passed in Florence in 1289 which was framed with the object of finally putting an end to this state of affairs. It enacted that any contract which concerned the sale of *fideles* or *coloni* should be null and void, and that the contracting parties were to be subject to penalties; serfs are not mentioned in the act, and from this fact writers infer that the class of serfs had gradually ceased to exist before the law was passed.⁴⁰

When the feudal system ceased to exist, another method had to be chosen for the landowners and husbandmen, and in a very short space of time the *mezzeria* system was generally adopted in the Florentine territory.

While the feudal system was still in force in Italy certain lands belonging to the communes had always been tilled by free laborers; a writer surmises that the tradition of the *mezzeria* had been retained from Roman times by the conquered population. It is a fact that the *mezzeria* was established with great rapidity. A few *mezzeria* contracts are in existence which date from the thirteenth century,⁴¹ at the time when the feudal system was in process of dissolution, and in the next century we find that it was in general use in the Florentine territory where it has continued in practice for over six hundred years.

³⁷ Pietro Santini, "Condizione Personale degli Abitanti del Contado nel Secolo XIII.," in *Archivio Storico Italiano*, fourth ser., XVII. 178-192.

³⁸ Pietro Capei, *ubi sup.*

³⁹ Sale of the castle of Trevalle to the commune of Florence, Mar. 22, 1225. Pietro Santini, *ubi sup.*

⁴⁰ Pasquale Villari, *The Two First Centuries of Florentine History*, Eng. trans. (London, 1894), pp. 300, 301. Villari gives the text of the law.

⁴¹ Ticcianti, "Un Contratto di Mezzeria del 1274", in *Rivista di Agricoltura e Commercio della Provincia di Arezzo*, April, 1890. Capei and Davidsohn refer to early contracts but they are not strictly speaking *mezzeria*.

The landowner in the present century undertakes to keep the farm-houses in good repair. He provides half the seed of the grain, Indian corn, and all the other crops, and half the manure, and he stocks the farms with cattle. The peasant, on his side, undertakes to look after the cattle, till the land, prune the vines and fruit-trees, keep the ditches in good order, and provide half the seed and manure. The peasant usually keeps a pig⁴² and some poultry, which are not supplied by the landowner, and for this privilege he has to pay a yearly tribute consisting of a ham and a specified number of eggs and capons.

Most of Lapo's conditions are similar to those in the twentieth-century compacts, but some clauses differ; for instance, in the present day the cattle and horses belong to the proprietor, who shares with the peasant the profits realized by sales of live stock or the losses resulting from accident or sickness, while in the fourteenth century it was customary for the landowner to lend the peasant money to buy cattle. Lapo lent fifteen gold florins to "Francesco, son of Pietro called Besso", to buy a pair of oxen and he stipulates that

whatsoever the said oxen may cost over and above the 15 gold florins that I lend him must be paid with his own money, and if he were to make a profit on the said oxen it shall be his, and if he were to incur a loss, from which may God preserve him! the damage shall be his and I shall have nothing to do with it. The said gold florins that I have lent him are written down in his debit account in my own book of the affairs of the villa.

The pigs, as we have seen, are not as a rule the property of the landowner in the present day. In the fourteenth century, landowner and peasant each paid half the price of the pig and as Lapo wrote when Deo, son of Biago, took his farm at Galuzzo in 1408—

And he and I are to keep a pig between us. I am to pay half of its cost and he must pay the other half, and if he should not wish to keep one, the year that he shall not keep it he must give me eighty pounds of the meat of a male pig and the weight of the pig from which he gives me the meat must be two hundred lbs. or more, in order that I may not have any gristle.

The farms in the twentieth century are not granted on a term of years, but are let on yearly leases, while in the fourteenth century the farms were let for three years. It is a curious fact that in the present day when the farms are only held by the year, the peasants remain as a rule for generations on the same farm; while in the

⁴² The conditions about pigs in the present day vary in different districts; in some parts of Tuscany they are given to the peasant on the same terms as the cattle.

fourteenth and fifteenth centuries the peasants seem to have been constantly flitting from farm to farm. There were exceptions, however, and Lapo recorded that Francesco, son of Piero called Besso, worked on the farm of Paterno for thirty years and at Francesco's death the farm was transferred to his son Piero. Francesco and Piero were peasant proprietors and owned a bit of land which they tilled, as well as Lapo's farm.

The peasant who held the farm at Lapo's country place near Florence had obligations from which some of the others were exempt—he undertook to convey Lapo's share of the wheat, barley, oats, oil, beans, and fruit to Florence, also a part of the wine; on the other hand, he had the advantage of carrying away the manure from Lapo's stable, the refuse and sweepings from the house,⁴³ and the "bor-racino",⁴⁴ as the clippings of wool were called, that came from Lapo's shop. All this was used as manure.

The method of green manuring with fodder crops was also practised, half the expense of the seed being charged to the peasant and half to the proprietor. The rotation of crops seems to have been triennial and the order was probably beans or lupins, wheat, barley or spelt, and "trifolio", lucerne; if lucerne was used, the rotation must have taken six years, as the lucerne would have been left on the ground for two years.

The peasant was obliged to manure one-third of the farm every year and to dig one-third of the land. Lapo, as we have seen, derived no profit from cattle-breeding, and his sons and grandsons followed his example and kept no cattle on their land. There are rare instances, however, of landowners who possessed live stock, and in the inventories of property inherited by wards⁴⁵ we read occasionally of cattle that belonged to the landowner. In these cases the cattle were as a rule merely valued and no description of them was given, but in one list a cow is described as being of a red color and having short horns.⁴⁶ A breed of this kind must have been common in Italy in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, for the early painters often introduce the head of a red cow or ox behind the figure of the

⁴³ The floors were strewn with rushes.

⁴⁴ These clippings of wool are still used for manuring the land. At Prato in Tuscany, a large amount of cloth is manufactured and the clippings of wool from the factories are used for manuring olive trees.

⁴⁵ These government registers are in the Archivio di Stato in Florence and are entitled Pupilli.

⁴⁶ Pupilli, vol. 4, p. 265 (tergo), year 1384.

Madonna in their pictures of the adoration of the Magi and of the Nativity, and as a rule these animals have short horns.⁴⁷

The following contract was drawn up by Lapo for the peasant who took the farm adjoining his country house at Galuzzo. I give the whole contract, though Lapo repeats himself about the carriage of the crops:

We granted our *podere* (farm) of Galuzzo or rather of the Campora, or as it is called the Romituza, situated partly in the parish of San Chirico at Marignolle and partly in the parish of Santa Maria at Massa Pagana, to Matteo, son of Duccio called Duzi, and to Andrea, son of Matteo, on the ⁴⁸ day of ⁴⁸ 1386, for the time and term of three years with the following stipulations, conditions, and customs.

They must keep one ox and one ass at the said place for use on my property and they must not till any other farm or land but mine and they must not undertake carrying or other service.⁴⁹

They must keep one pig, which is to be the common property. I shall have to pay one half of its cost and they must pay the other half, and later when it is fat it will be divided in half.

They must manure with fodder crops at least one-third of the farm every year, and if they were to manure more land I should be pleased.

They must dig a third part of the vineyards every year, and they must put at least a hundred layers yearly, and I must pay half [their labor] and they must give the other half.

And they must put seventy-five loads⁵⁰ of refuse and stable manure on the said land without counting the manure that is produced on the said place,⁵¹ and I must give them six *lire* and ten *soldi* out of the profits;⁵² and they must come for all the clippings of wool that may be made in my shop and the refuse and stable manure there may be in my house in Florence.⁵³

⁴⁷ For instance, Agnolo Gaddi, Uffizi, no. 28; Simone Bolognese, no. 260; Filippino Lippi, no. 1257.

⁴⁸ A blank space in the manuscript.

⁴⁹ Meaning except for Lapo himself.

⁵⁰ The word in Italian is *some*, which means the burden that an ass or a horse can carry in two paniers, and which can be roughly estimated at a hundred kilos weight.

⁵¹ This sentence is obscure. It runs in Italian, "et io senza quello si facesse in sul detto luogo"; if "et io" were suppressed the meaning is clear. Lapo sometimes began a sentence and then crossed out irrelevant words. I have assumed that in this case he omitted to erase "et io".

⁵² In another contract, we read that the peasants were in the habit of collecting other refuse and stable manure besides that which came from Lapo's house and stable, which was paid for by Lapo at 40 per cent. less than its market value. In this case a fixed sum must have been agreed upon for the refuse which came from other houses and shops.

⁵³ It is more clearly put in another contract: "and he", the peasant, "must come" to Florence "for all the clippings of wool that are made in the shops, and he must come for all the litter of the stable, and for all the sweepings of the house".

And they must bring to Florence all the loads of all and everything that is gathered on the said land; they are to undertake the carriage and I must pay the duty; wine alone is excepted, as they are only obliged to bring one *cogno*⁵⁴ and a half of wine to Florence, and if there were to be more wine, I Lapo engage to pay the carriage of whatever there may be over and above one *cogno* and a half.

And they must give me every year for the feast⁵⁵ two pair of good capons and ten dozen eggs.

And they must bring to me in Florence all the loads of each and every thing that is gathered there, to wit, wheat, barley, spelt, beans, oil, and fruit,⁵⁶ the carriage at their charge and the duty at my expense excepting wine, as they are only obliged to bring one *cogno* and a half, and if my share of the vintage were to be more, I, Lapo, must pay it [the carriage].

And they must till the land like good husbandmen and keep the ditches both of the vineyards and of the other land in good order and if they were to go away, they must leave it [the farm] improved and not in a worse state.

And I Lapo am to lend them⁵⁷ florins to buy the said ox and the said ass for use on my said place.

At the bottom of the page Lapo adds, "They went away and we granted the said farm to Sandro, son of Bianciotto called Sandrone, as appears further on in this book, carta 29". Sandrone only remained six years on the farm, and after he left it, between the years 1398 and 1426, ten peasants in succession held it for terms varying from one to six years. Sandrone took it again in 1414, but gave it up at the end of the year.

When a new tenant was installed Lapo often made some slight alteration in the contract. In the contract with Sandrone in 1392 three new clauses were added to those already given:

And he must pay half the cost of the fodder crops⁵⁸ that may be sown there and I, Lapo, must pay the other half. . . .

And he must not cut down any tree either cultivated or wild, but when I come to an agreement with him as to what shall be cut, then I am to have one-half and he is to have the other half of what is cut for his benefit, and not less. Nevertheless, I can have the fruit-trees and those that are unfruitful cut down by others at my pleasure and the wood and every other thing that comes off them shall all be mine. . . .

⁵⁴ A *cogno* was usually equal to ten barrels of wine, but the measurement varied in different places. *Vocabolario della Crusca*.

⁵⁵ Of All Saints.

⁵⁶ The text is "grano biada, olio fructa". In the official register of the revenue of the farms belonging to Lapo's four youngest sons we read the following explanation of the word "biada": "*biada*, cioe spelda et fave", and again "*biada*, fave, spelda et orzo".

⁵⁷ A blank in the manuscript.

⁵⁸ The Italian word is "*sovescio*", which means the fodder crops that are ploughed down for manure.

And if it were to be necessary to smear the vines with bird lime, he must pay for half the resin and mistletoe and I the other half.⁵⁹

The peasants who lived on the farms further from the town were not obliged to carry the crops to Florence, but on the other hand they had not the advantage of carrying away the refuse and manure from the town house; in some instances they were allowed to act as carriers on their own account. There was more live stock too on their farms. The peasants who held the farm of Barberino were to keep

two large oxen or three middle-sized oxen for the use of the said place, and [Lapo writes] we must share the cost of the swine. I will pay one-half and they shall pay the other half and they must keep at least a pair, and if they were to keep more they must always be half theirs and half mine, and if they were to keep sows all the profits must be shared by them and me. And I am content that one of the three [peasants] shall undertake carrying, and they may keep either two asses, or a mule and an ass; and they must keep a flock of sheep on the place, and if they were not to have sheep of their own they must take some of mine, and if I should not wish to let them have my sheep they may take them from any person that best pleases them.

A farm like the Campora at Galuzzo which was constantly changing hands could not prosper, and we find that it was untilled in 1430 when it had passed into the hands of Lapo's four younger sons. Lapo kept no record of the revenue he received from the land, but later, when the government levied an income-tax called the "decima", proprietors were obliged to give an account of the produce of their farms, and these reports were inscribed in the official register. Lapo's sons, who inherited the farm at Galuzzo, wrote in 1430: "The *podere* is untilled and has been so for the last two years, and we have not gathered either wheat, spelt, beans, or oats. There is no peasant; therefore we have had the vineyards cultivated by other laborers. Ciaperno di Nuccio farmed the land and he had a loan of twenty-five florins and he departed and has nothing left." Twelve barrels of wine were the sole produce of the farm.⁶⁰

The returns from agriculture in fertile Tuscany must of necessity be very fluctuating; in a region subject to violent hail-storms and late frosts, the crops or vintage are often destroyed in a few hours, while in time of plenty the farms yield large profits. In the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries the industry of husbandry was still more precarious and what the elements spared was often taken as booty by the troops of a hostile state, or by the hordes of merce-

⁵⁹ The mixture called bird-lime was smeared on the vines after they were grafted; it was composed of resin and mistletoe.

⁶⁰ R. Archivio di Stato, Florence, Catasto, Ruote Secondo, 359.

naries who lived by rapine and plunder, when they were not engaged in the service of some prince or republic.

Some of Lapo's sons were prosperous merchants and all had some source of income besides the proceeds of their farms, but in the next generation Lapo's grandchildren could not face the loss of revenue from the land with equanimity. We infer from a report written by Tommaso Niccolini in 1470 that he was ruined for the time being and that he had to take refuge under his brother's roof. In the register of the *catasto* for the year, Tommaso, one of Lapo's grandsons, thus reports on a farm belonging to him in Val d'Elsa. "It is quite two years that nothing is to be had from the farm because of the war and the soldiery", and he adds, "I have no house of my own and I am living with Messer Agniolo [his brother] and for two years or more I have gathered nothing [from the farm] and this year I have sown nothing, because the oxen and all the cattle that were on it were taken as booty."⁶¹

Tommaso's heirs again tell the same sad story about the same farm in September 1498—"And it gives no returns because of the war".⁶²

The bad years often spelled ruin to the husbandman, and his only resource was to live on the charity of the landowner. When the latter could not or would not come to the rescue, the peasants ended their lives as beggars like Alessandra Strozzi's poor old tenant. In her case, the peasant was too old and infirm to work, and she was not disposed to give him help. She wrote in one of her letters with extraordinary cynicism: "Piero and Mona Cilia [the peasants] are still alive and both infirm. I have let the farm for the coming year

⁶¹ This must have happened during the war which Bartolommeo Colleoni declared on the republic at the instigation of the Florentine exiles. No fighting took place near Florence, but the spoliation of the farms was evidently due to the troops of the Duke of Calabria, a Florentine ally. His soldiers spent some time in Tuscany and being without their pay "they acted in friendly countries as if they had to do with their enemies". Reumont, *Lorenzo de' Medici the Magnificent*, Eng. trans., I. 217.

⁶² *Catasto* for the year 1498. This was probably the result of the war waged by Pope Sixtus IV. with his ally King Ferrante of Naples against the Florentines, though it took place between 1470 and 1480. There were hostilities in Val d'Elsa, and the war was carried on with unusual cruelty and brutality; the enemy looted and then burned all the farm buildings, they also burned all the fodder they could not take away, and they even carried off the peasant women and children as prisoners.

Luca Firidolfi in his report on his property of Panzano in 1457 describes the damage done to his farms by the enemy's troops. Houses and barns were burned and the cattle carried off to the enemy's camp, etc. *Un Fiorentino del Secolo XV: le sue Domestiche Ricordanze*.

and I must set it in order; if those two old people were not to die, they will have to go and beg. May God provide for them.”⁶³

She wrote five months later—Mona Cilia had apparently died in the meantime—“I have engaged a new laborer at Pazzolatico [the name of the farm]. . . . Piero still lives; he must quit the place and he will have to go about asking for alms. Moreover, I can not do more than what is possible. He must put up with it, and if God were to call him to himself, it would be for the best.”⁶⁴

On the other hand, the foundation of a fortune was often laid in prosperous years and some of the richest merchants in Florence had begun life as peasants; when they had saved enough to start business they “left the spade”, as Villani has it, and we meet them a little later in the city with a fortune made in a day.⁶⁵ “They are ill-bred churls, puffed out with riches, who neither appreciate good manners nor show courtesy to others, and whose only desire in life is to heap up gold, with which they vainly hope to ennoble themselves.”⁶⁶

The system of *mezzeria* is based on the understanding that the proprietor and peasant are to share the profits, but in practice the landowner never receives half the returns from the farm. It is impossible for the most vigilant overseer to control the exact division of the smaller crops, and the potatoes, turnips, French beans, water-melons, figs, and other fruit, are often divided when the peasant and his family have already taken all they want. The proprietor of the fourteenth century did not accept the situation in a philosophical spirit; here is an unflattering portrait of the peasants drawn by a landlord of the time. He is supposed to be speaking to his sons.⁶⁷

It is an incredible thing how dishonesty has increased among the peasants. All their minds are set on how best they can deceive us. No account was ever kept with them in which they were the losers; they always try to keep something of yours. The peasant asks in the first place that the ox, the sheep, the goats, the sow, and the mare should be bought for him, then he asks a loan to pay his creditors; he wants new clothes for his family and dowries for his daughters. He asks to have the barn and other outhouses rebuilt and many of the farming utensils renewed and he will never cease complaining when he is well supplied with money and perhaps better off than his master; then he will lament the more and say he is poor. He is always wanting something and he never speaks to you without bringing some expense upon you. If the

⁶³ Alessandra Macinghi Strozzi, *Lettere ai Figliuoli*, lettera XLVIII.

⁶⁴ *Id.*, lettera LXI.

⁶⁵ Francesco da Barberino, *Documenti d'Amore*, p. 77.

⁶⁶ Filippo Villani, “La Vita di Francesco da Barberino”, in *Le Vite d'Uomini Illustre Fiorentini* (Florence, 1826).

⁶⁷ Alberti, *Trattato del Governo della Famiglia*, ed. G. Finzi (Florence, 1890), p. 66.

crops are abundant, he garners two-thirds of the best for himself. If on account of bad storms or for other reasons the land is sterile, he assigns all the loss to you. The best returns are always his and the damage and loss always fall to your share.

Other writers dwell on the necessity for prudence and watchfulness in dealing with the peasant.⁶⁸ Morelli exhorts the proprietor to be vigilant, to keep watch on the peasants, on their houses, on the crops in the field, on the threshing-floor, and in the measures; and "above all", he writes, "never believe what you do not see and never trust any of them".⁶⁹

According to Alberti, however, there were compensations for the troubles and anxieties of the landowner's life, and the proprietor forgot all his woes when he rested in the shade on feast days and held pleasant converse with his friends about the herds, the wool, the ox, the vineyards and the sowing. Everything, he said, is discussed with enjoyment and all listen with interest and take pleasure in hearing what you have to say. Everyone talks of things pertaining to agriculture and each one corrects and teaches and points out where you erred in planting and sowing. Albeit no envy, no hatred, no malice is engendered, but rather commendation.⁷⁰

In those early days neither proprietor nor peasant was satisfied with his share, but during the passage of six centuries the system has been perfected and adapted to new methods of culture, though remaining the same in essentials. Both partners in the agricultural industry now realize that the *mezzeria* is perhaps the best solution that has yet been found for the vexed land question, and can say with Pliny that "there is no sort of revenue more agreeable to reason than what arises from the bounty of the soil, the seasons, and the climate".⁷¹

GINEVRA NICCOLINI DI CAMUGLIANO.

⁶⁸ Pietro de' Crescenzi, *Trattato della Agricoltura*, ed. Bart. Sorio (Verona, 1851-1852), l. XI., c. 8 (II. 264).

⁶⁹ Giovanni Morelli, *Cronica*, MCCXCIII.

⁷⁰ *Governo della Famiglia*, p. 71.

⁷¹ Pliny, l. IX., ep. 37.

FRENCH AID BEFORE THE ALLIANCE OF 1778¹

IF one appeals to reason rather than to feeling there arises a real question whether Lafayette's name should be selected as that of the Frenchman who ought to symbolize the sentiment which America will perhaps always feel toward France for that aid which made possible a favorable outcome for the American Revolution. The more deeply one searches the records of that time, the more one is inclined to give to Vergennes or to Beaumarchais the greatest credit for that succor in time of need which raised the United States to the position of a member of the family of nations. Not even the unselfishness of Lafayette's services can be established to such an extent as is commonly supposed. Revenge for the ills suffered by France, ambition for personal glory, and even bitter disappointment in the America he once idealized can be clearly proven from the records.² To whatever hero one should award the greatest personal contribution in the consummation of France's signal service, one can not doubt the wholly decisive character of the aid rendered. Not only must we credit France with the prestige which her alliance gave America, with the naval and military aid she furnished, with bringing Spain into the struggle, and with that momentary command of the sea off Chesapeake Bay which made the surrender of Yorktown inevitable, but also with that early secret aid which furnished almost ninety per cent. of the munitions of war which made the very continuance of military resistance possible during 1776 and which made the victory at Saratoga even conceivable. The investigations of Dr. O. W. Stephenson have established beyond a reasonable doubt that France, either directly or through foreign merchants whom she encouraged secretly, got into American hands a very large part of all the gunpowder, arms, and manufactured articles necessary to supply the American army during 1776 and 1777.³ France, in a word, gave in secret the

¹ Paper read before the American Historical Association at Richmond, Dec. 29, 1924.

² Lafayette wrote (end of 1779): "Je commence à m'apercevoir que, séduit par un faux enthousiasme de gloire, j'ai fait une sottise de passer chez les Américains. Mais je sens aussi que c'en serait une plus grande de revenir. Le vin est tiré, il faut le boire jusqu'à la lie, mais cette lie se fait déjà sentir." (Quoted from *Corresp. Secret.*) E. Raume, *Chansonniers*, IX. 204.

³ The bare results of a long and exhaustive research are published in the *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XXX. 271-281.

means making possible the deeds by which she herself in the end was to be encouraged to ally herself openly with the American colonies.

And yet what is more paradoxical than that the oldest and most despotic king in Christendom should give aid to the rebellious subjects of a brother king? The righteous and conscientious Louis XVI., doomed to die on the scaffold for the manifold sins and wickednesses of his fathers, was led to a decision which hastened that fatal day by motives in part peculiar to the age of despots, in part common to all ages.

Quite unaware that the waters were gathering which would "wash the balm from an anointed king", the ministers of both the French monarchs whose reigns immediately antedated the French Revolution urged upon them a recovery of prestige and a consequent revenge for the downfall of 1763. By that peace France lost her commerce and credit in India. She lost Canada, Louisiana, Isle Royale, Acadia, and Senegal. She issued from the war deeply in debt. Her allies were disaffected, her ambassadors marched behind those of England at affairs of state in foreign capitals, and all Frenchmen mourned the shame of Dunkirk where no stone could be turned, no pier erected, without England's consent. Nine years later her helplessness at the time of the partition of Poland revealed how she was despised in all the courts of Europe. When Maria Theresa wept but took her share of Poland, it meant that even France's own ally was party to the crime and scorned to ask her advice. In vain Vergennes mourned the absolute scorn of the principles of decency and justice shown in the conduct of the bandit powers who despoiled the richest territory of a feeble and impotent state. He doubted whether posterity would believe that indignant Europe looked on and did nothing. Where is the safety of any state, he cried, if such political brigandage can be consummated before the eyes of Europe? Even England, zealous for the balance of power, turned her eyes away and dared not protest. If force is right and decency a mere name, where is the safety of states, he asked.⁴

That Vergennes should lash himself into fury over this partition of Poland is all the more noteworthy, because the fresh air of moral indignation did not often sweeten the fetid atmosphere of diplomacy in those days. This Polish affair especially completed the effacement of France.⁵ Once the centre of all European activity, she became, wrote a Frenchman, an unheeded onlooker. None cared for her favor or her wishes. Of all great powers she was least considered. England was in the ascendant, France at the nadir, of her power.

⁴ Doniol, *Histoire de la Participation*, I. 15.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

France, whose pride had grown with what it fed upon, would not accept her fate. D'Argenson in happier days had looked upon France as sustaining the feeble and oppressed, "the paternal protector" who gave the law to Europe, "so it be a just law", and, though feared by all, had nothing to fear from them.⁶ France's greatness, France's antiquity, her rôle of leadership, and the tradition of her grandeur were instilled into the minds of all French diplomats as a fundamental principle of their activity in every court of Europe.⁷ The Hohenzollern demand in those old grandiloquent days before November 11, 1918, that "nothing must be settled in this world without the intervention of the German emperor", would have come as naturally from the lips of Bourbon princes or their ministers in the eighteenth century. That a French king should lead in Europe was a "dogma consecrated by a thousand years", cried Broglie.⁸ France in the centre of Europe has the right to influence all great affairs, asserted the Count de Vergennes. To him the Bourbon throne was a tribunal set up by Providence to adjudicate the rights of kings.⁹ Walpole might think the monarch "weak, and weak eyed",¹⁰ but in the view of a French minister he was Jove himself.

The great menace to this tradition of grandeur was England. As early as 1740 Maurepas perceived the threat of this "usurping race", of these "ancient enemies", now almost the masters of the fate of Europe.¹¹ Choiseul in 1764 denounced to his master the intrigues, the jealousy, the "haughty tone" of England in the world's affairs. This arch-enemy of French power aimed, he declared, at supremacy "in the four quarters of the globe".¹² There was no peace with such a race. Choiseul put the worst interpretation upon all England's actions in the past and all her plans for the future. The Seven Years' War had begun with a "scandalous rupture". All the "maxims of the rights of nations", the most "sacred rules of equity", were then thrown to the ground. England's true aim had been to rob France of her American colonies and trade. For the future she evidently planned to seize all Louisiana,

⁶ *Journal et Mémoires du Marquis d'Argenson* (Paris, 1859), I. 325, 371, IV. 131.

⁷ A. Sorel, *Recueil des Instructions données aux Ambassadeurs*, etc., I. 356.

⁸ Ségur, *La Politique de Tous les Cabinets*, I. 229.

⁹ Flassan, *Histoire Générale et Raisonnée de la Diplomatie Française* (Paris, 1809), VI. 134.

¹⁰ Walpole, *Letters*, ed. Toynbee, VI. 310.

¹¹ Maurepas, *Mémoires*, ed. Soulavie (1792), III. 93, 161, 194, 205, 241.

¹² Archives des Affaires Étrangères, *Mémoires et Documents*, France, vol. 581, f. 41.

penetrate thus to New Mexico, and in time follow Cromwell's plan and open the way through Central America to all of Spain's possessions. To this end England aimed to stifle the French marine at its birth and to rule the sea alone.¹³ The Abbé Raynal declared that a new power, sea power, had given the universe to Europe, and Europe to England, whose "spirit of rapine" had led her to rule the sea and thus dominate the states of the world.¹⁴ Belief in this, added to the age-long traditional enmity of France and England, created a bitterness which made the treaty of Paris a mere suspension of hostilities.

The pen that signed the treaty for France was not dry before Choiseul began his efforts to reverse the decision of destiny. Like a Trojan he worked to wipe out that hateful memory. He repaired French naval losses, reformed the army, bettered the finance.¹⁵ He thought seriously of an invasion of England, sending agents to seek landing-places and sources of supply. Portsmouth was doomed, at least in Choiseul's mind. He instigated Spain to question the right of English ships to sail the Pacific, though Pitt had said that England would sooner consent to give up the Tower of London than abandon that right. Choiseul's secret agents searched every crevice of British armor in England and America and so worried Pitt that he cried out against such activities in a world "infatuated, bewitched".¹⁶

The French archives in the period from 1763 to 1775 abound in *mémoires*, diaries, letters, and reports filled with the same purposes, revenge upon England, a death-blow to its commerce, a revival of that of France, and finally the restoration of French prestige in Europe.¹⁷ During all that period French spies, roaming afar through England and America, kept the French government intimately informed as to the state of the British national debt, the size of its

¹³ *Ibid.*, ff. 3, 4.

¹⁴ Abbé Raynal, *Histoire des Indes* (1781), V. 203, VII. 208, IX. 80, X. 136.

¹⁵ Rochford to Shelburne, Jan. 7, 1767 (intercepted letter of Merci quoted), Shelburne Papers.

¹⁶ Royal Historical Society *Transactions*, third ser., IV. 83-107; Stanhope, *Pitt*, V. 247; Coxe, *Memoirs of the House of Bourbon*, III. 298.

¹⁷ The prospects of commerce with free America form the principal theme of most *mémoires* in the French archives. Mr. Corwin in his "French Objective" (*Am. Hist. Rev.*, XXI. 33-61) puts a great deal of stress upon the restoring of French prestige in Europe and seems to belittle the motive of increased trade with America or hoped-for decrease in England's trade. But French statesmen, royal and noble writers of petitions, economists, and all who wrote memorials to the king urged the trade argument, and often gave as its purpose the increase of power and of wealth which would bring in its train the restoration of French prestige.

navy and its army, the meaning of its political crises, and every aspect of its relation with its colonies.¹⁸

Choiseul hoarded every document, every proclamation and revolutionary broadside, every seditious American sermon or clipping from a rebellious newspaper. The surest way to his favor was to report discontent and trouble in the Carolinas or Virginia, as did the crafty Chevalier d'Éon, while nothing so damned an agent, the Baron de Kalb found to his chagrin, as to report that the colonies caressed their chains.¹⁹

In America these secret emissaries took every means to spread dissatisfaction among the colonists. They took pains to impress Americans with their own importance. Their strength was represented as an object of greater magnitude than the British rulers were aware. No insinuation lacked to induce a spirit of discontent.²⁰ Franklin, in 1767, declared that France, "the intriguing nation", was blowing up the coals between Great Britain and her colonies, and he, at that time, hoped to prevent her success.²¹

The French foreign archives of this period contain scores of reports of French government spies, but the tritons among the minnows were M. de Pontleroy and the Baron de Kalb. Pontleroy was a well-informed naval officer who for twenty years had been useful to the French government in a like capacity. His great fault was that when he became gorged with information he seemed to fall into a state of mental coma,²² so that he wrote and talked painfully, and only the patient efforts of Durand, acting as agent for Choiseul, drew out his report. In 1764 he had journeyed along the New England coast and then passed on to the middle colonies. He gave a fairly accurate account of the economic strength of the colonies, the population of each, and the rate of increase. Children in America he found swarming like ants. There was noted the number of men furnished in the Seven Years' War by each colony, the fortifications, the number of men in garrisons, and the plans of each fort.²³ He had the locality of their arsenals and their *parcs* of artillery. With the aid of exiled Acadians apparently he got the soundings of some ports

¹⁸ Archives des Affaires Étrangères, Corresp. Politique, Angleterre, vols. 474, 475, *passim*.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, vol. 450, ff. 392, 410; vol. 451, ff. 23, 115, 140, 218.

²⁰ J. Andrews, *Hist. of the War with America*, I. 20.

²¹ Bancroft, *Hist. of the U. S.*, III. 261.

²² Archives Nationales, Marine, C7, 255.

²³ Arch. Aff. Étr., Corr. Pol., Angleterre, vol. 471, ff. 8, 9. Durand's report with some omissions is in print in C. DeWitt, *Thomas Jefferson*, second ed., pp. 407-417.

and rivers and learned the distances between important towns, the state of the roads between them, and how each might be attacked and pillaged. He discovered whither colonial vessels went and how they were escorted.²⁴ He furnished full plans for taking Boston, New York, and Philadelphia, and estimated that French armies could live long on the country in New York and Pennsylvania, but ventured the unflattering prediction that in barren and rock-ribbed New England they would starve to death. He offered a rosy plan for an attack on the colonial fishing fleet.²⁵ The sea was the New Englander's farm; he reasoned that if France could destroy the fisheries and the fleets of the merchants the colonists would press the British government for peace. He even planned for the same end to destroy their business records, and hoped to corrupt their "corsairs" so that they would prey on British rather than French trade.

Pontleroy thought that he knew all the reasons for America's unrest. First, the colonists, since 1763, no longer feared France, and therefore felt less need of British protection. Next he testified to have witnessed their wrath over the Sugar Act, and spoke of their rage over the British revenue ships sent to stop their illicit trade with the French and Spanish West Indies. He heard their complaints over the loss of cash once acquired in this illegal trade.²⁶ He found them boasting of their power. He believed them too rich to be obedient, eager to be the sole masters of their fur trade, and restive to shake off the fetters and restraints on their commerce.²⁷ They would be seduced soon or late, he declared, to seize for their own profit the islands near the American continent. It must have been cold comfort for a French minister to find Pontleroy frank to say that the colonists wished for war with France to the end that they might conquer St. Domingo and St. Pierre de Miquelon, one as a needed market, the other to control the fisheries.²⁸

He rejoiced to find the New Englanders lovers of liberty, always ready to murmur against government. He was told that in Boston the colonists would not allow the British to fortify the harbor, lest the forts be used to subject them to acts of Parliament. To the south in Pennsylvania he believed the indentured servants would be glad

²⁴ Aug. 3, 7, 9, 1766, Arch. Aff. Étr., Corr. Pol., Angleterre, vol. 471, ff. 7-9, 124-125. Three months later Pontleroy wrote at length to the Duc de Praslin. Arch. Nat., Marine, B⁴, vol. 111, ff. 11-13; vol. 106, f. 144.

²⁵ Arch. Aff. Étr., Angleterre, vol. 471, ff. 7-9.

²⁶ Arch. Nat., Marine, B⁴, vol. 111, f. 13.

²⁷ Report of another French spy, in 1765, agrees. *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XXVII. 84.

²⁸ Arch. Nat., Marine, B⁴, vol. 111, f. 11; Arch. Aff. Étr., Angleterre, vol. 471, ff. 7, 8.

to escape.²⁹ And he found the Germans, Palatines, and Alsatians discontented with the British government, hating the local Presbyterian and Quaker assemblymen. All were more loyal to Germany than to England. He believed that revolution would be the end of all of England's efforts to better the lot of her colonists. Should it come to war France might recruit troops in Pennsylvania, and he advised getting a leader for such recruits with a name that would recall old German heroes.³⁰ There is much evidence that the French ministers not only read these reports, but pondered them deeply.

In the year after Pontleroy's visit a spy whose identity is unknown, but who had great gifts as an observer, passed through the colonies at the height of the Stamp Act excitement.³¹ He presented credentials to men of provincial prominence, and had contact with a remarkable number of men, like Dulany, Joseph Galloway, James Christie, and others who later became Loyalists. Though often dined and wined by governors, and others of great prominence, he also mingled with those who "damned their souls" if they would pay stamp duties. They would fight, he was told, to the last drop of their blood before they would consent to any such slavery. After feasting, the bottle went round and rage against the Stamp Act augmented, until they talked of taking up arms and coping with Great Britain. Even a magistrate who in the early evening reproved their disaffection admitted, as the night wore on, that if it came to a push he would take up arms himself in defense of his liberty.³² The king's health was usually followed by that of the Virginia Assembly, then damnation to the Stamp Act, until, the spy confessed, "we scarce used to go to bed sober".³³ In Virginia he heard a great deal about that "Noble Patriot Mr. Henery", and all declared publicly that if the least injury were offered they would stand by him to the last drop of their blood.

Besides these observations on the temper of the people he reported with great fullness and judgment the rural and town economy, the general conditions, and ventured the prophecy that the country would not be long subject to Great Britain. Its extent was too

²⁹ Another French spy, 1765, name unknown, agreed on this matter with Pontleroy. *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XXVII. 84.

³⁰ Arch. Nat., Marine, B⁴, vol. 111, ff. 11-15; Arch. Aff. Étr., Angleterre, vol. 471, ff. 18-19.

³¹ Document in *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XXVI. 726-747, and XXVII. 70-89.

³² *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XXVII. 72-73.

³³ Attending a celebration of the "King's Birth Night", he was much disappointed as to the throng he hoped to see, for there was not above a dozen people. *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XXVI. 746.

great, its growth too rapid. Not only was there immigration from every part of Europe, but he saw about the farmers' houses children swarming like broods of ducks in a pond. This growing race had around them everything needed, and all things for their own defense. No nation was better calculated for independence, the people were disposed to it, and there was nothing they talked of more.³⁴

It is very noteworthy that the French, with whom the wish was father to the thought, were much more clear-sighted in foreseeing rebellion in America than the British.³⁵ Montcalm had dreamed of it just before he fell on the field of glory at Quebec. Choiseul a few years later counselled his royal master, Louis XV.:³⁶

There will come in time a revolution in America—but [he added ruefully] we shall probably not see it—which will put England into a state of weakness where she will be no longer a terror in Europe. . . . The very extent of the English possessions in America will bring about their separation from England, but as I have said, this event is yet far off.

Nearly three years after the Stamp Act, the eager French minister sent the Baron de Kalb not only to report conditions and resources, but to learn whether the colonists, raging against the Townshend Acts, had a plan of revolt and were rebellious enough to desire trained officers and engineers. What use did they mean to make of the munitions "they were getting"? Were they sincere in the desire to resist Great Britain?³⁷ De Kalb, judicious, sensible, able to grasp the real issues, made the mistake of reporting the truth, rather than what his master wished.³⁸ He found the Americans complaining that their commerce was so regulated as to draw all their specie to England, that they were obliged to support troops meant to oppress not protect them, that British regulation pre-

³⁴ *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XXVII. 84. About the same time, October, 1765, D'Estaing was writing to Choiseul from St. Domingo of one Hopkins to whom he had given the use of his house and with whom he had talked at length. He had a great knowledge of America as to the fortifications, conditions, revolutions in progress, places most easily attacked. *Arch. Nat., Colonies*, C⁹ A (St. Domingo), 124.

³⁵ Yet Englishmen did fear it. See letter in *Arch. Aff. Étr., Angleterre*, vol. 474, f. 273, Durand to Choiseul: "Il n'y a personne en Angleterre qui n'avoue que, faute de prévoyance, les colonies qu'elle possède en Amérique formeront un jour un état séparé: c'est la forme de cette révolution que je désirerois de prévoir", etc.

³⁶ *Arch. Aff. Étr., Corr. Politique, Angleterre*, vol. 515, f. 21; *Mém. et Doc., France*, vol. 581, f. 41.

³⁷ *Bib. Nat., MSS. Français, Nouvelles Acq.*, no. 9435, ff. 352, 353. (The cipher scheme is here.)

³⁸ It made no difference that De Kalb brought back quantities of letters, public prints, and documents, proofs as strong as Holy Writ; Choiseul resented bad news.

vented the growth of their manufactures, the exploitation of their mines, and the growth of their forges and smithies. Trade with the French and Spanish West Indies was vanishing for like reasons. Their issues of paper money were forbidden, and they were coming to resent every interference by Parliament.³⁹ Yet in spite of all, in spite of a fierce spirit of sedition, De Kalb believed they nevertheless really loved England. There was certainly no disposition to shake off British domination by means of foreign power. Their own divisions would cease at once in the presence of a common enemy.⁴⁰ Any foreign aid they would deem dangerous to their liberties. Should France attack England, De Kalb felt sure that the British government could get in the colonies all the needed troops, money, vessels to conquer the French West Indies.⁴¹

Nevertheless, Kalb reasoned, soon or late the colonies will be free. The very distance from England made them so. He found the spirit of independence everywhere. Though there was more fermentation and vehemence in Boston the spirit of resistance was elsewhere the same. The New England colonies, peopled in the main by English, were more closely united. Their very privileges, he thought, had only increased their pride and arrogance, and Massachusetts, richest and most populous, gave the cue, the signal for independence.⁴² Even there they were fain to blame not so much the ministry as the governor, who for personal ends fomented trouble. He found them unable to imagine extreme measures, since the colonies were so important, the king so good, and their cause so just, that government must recognize itself in the wrong, and admit their claims.⁴³ The baron advised letting them alone, for though fated to be independent, all effort to push would only retard their progress

³⁹ Bib. Nat., MSS. Français, Nouvelles Acq., no. 9435, ff. 367-370. A translation is in Kapp, *Kalb*, pp. 62-67 (see also 286-292), but I take this from the original. Kalb's opinion is valuable because, as an outsider, he was likely to hear the real and not the simulated complaints.

⁴⁰ Bib. Nat., MSS. Français, Nouvelles Acq., no. 9437, ff. 365, 366, 378. All this was wholly opposed to the views of Châtelet (Durand's successor) which Choiseul thought "profound". Châtelet (1767) asked if there were a rupture "could France and Spain remain idle spectators of an opportunity which in all probability would never occur again?" Within six months America would be on fire and her success would depend on a foreign war. Could France and Spain risk the fire going out for want of fuel? C. DeWitt, *T. Jefferson*, second ed., pp. 56-57.

⁴¹ There are many indications that one solution often in the colonial mind for regaining lost trade with French and Spanish West India islands was to conquer them.

⁴² Bib. Nat., MSS. Français, Nouvelles Acq., no. 9435, f. 374.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, f. 375.

toward freedom—disagreeable advice, he knew, but based on the facts. Choiseul rewarded his faithful endeavor to tell the truth by tiring of the reporter and turning his noble back.

All this intrigue against the peace of Europe took place while perfect amity seemed to exist between France and Great Britain. Cordiality on the surface, suspicion and hate in secret, marked their relations. Each extended the hand of friendship, but consorted and intrigued with the other's enemies. In 1768 the French minister planned to form a league of Prussia, Russia, Austria, and Spain against the sea power of England, to take Gibraltar at any cost and close the Mediterranean to British commerce.⁴⁴ When France was in bad financial straits in 1770, the distresses of France were comfortable objects in British eyes, for, wrote Walpole, "one tiger is charmed if another tiger loses his tail".⁴⁵ Money and arms were openly collected in England to aid the Corsican rebels against France, and the British government secretly supplied them with ammunition.⁴⁶ Choiseul in anger vowed to collect money in France to aid sedition in New York and Boston.⁴⁷ The Corsican patriot Paoli was exalted in England, which France could revenge only by waiting eight years to show equal adoration of Franklin. In spite of Dr. Johnson's brutal opinion that the British had drubbed "those fellows", the French, into "a proper reverence for us",⁴⁸ the ministers of his Most Christian Majesty would never admit it. When in 1770 Choiseul fell from power, the policy of the French government was not altered.

Throughout the Choiseul régime of plot and counter-plot, the American colonies were little responsive. The colonists not only inherited the immemorial English hate and suspicion of France, but they had new reasons of their own for filling their vials of wrath. War after war with the French in Canada, embittered by the use of Indians to raid the English frontiers, increased the colonial bad blood toward all Frenchmen. The repugnance of Puritan New England to Catholic Canada waxed rather than waned with the decades. All American leaders believed that Bourbon despotism far exceeded any-

⁴⁴ Arch. Aff. Étr., Mém. et Docs., vol. 410, ff. 115-117. Shelburne to Devisme, Dec. 20, 1766 (Shelburne Papers). There is every evidence that France was on tip-toe at this time to spring to the aid of the colonies should there be a rupture with England over the matters in dispute. Arch. Aff. Étr., Angleterre, vol. 479, ff. 360-363.

⁴⁵ Walpole, *Letters*, ed. Toynbee, VII. 368.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 203, note; Hunt, *Pol. Hist. of England*, X. 98.

⁴⁷ Friedrich von Raumer, *Beiträge zur Neueren Geschichte* (1839), II. 163.

⁴⁸ Boswell's *Johnson* (ed. 1901), I. 417.

thing ever attributed to a British ruler by the most violent colonial demagogue. James Otis (in 1762) declared that the French king was a despotic arbitrary prince, his subjects very miserable.⁴⁹ Yet odious as France was, there is more than one bit of evidence to indicate that under the provocation of the Stamp Act a mysterious committee of American leaders sent secretly to London a man, who under certain political circumstances was to hasten to France to try to get secret aid, ammunition, and guns from the French government.⁵⁰ Durand more than once called that fact to Choiseul's attention, and the mysterious French spy of 1765 heard Virginians mutter between their teeth, let the worst come to worst we will call the French to our succor.⁵¹ So convinced was Durand of this intent that he urged having an agent in the colonies ready to blow up the fire, lying under the ashes, at the moment it is ready to burst out. All there is lacking, he exhorted, is arms, a chief, and courage for these people to make themselves independent. If there were a man in New York with the genius of a Cromwell, he could set up a republic there more easily than did the great Oliver. It is for France and Spain, he urged, to make that man appear.⁵²

That France, and perhaps Spain, would render aid to the American colonies, should they rebel against the mother country, had long been a hobgoblin rising in the darkening path of British statesmen. Lord Shelburne wrote in 1767: "If the colonies resist, France and Spain would no longer defer breaking a peace, the days of which they already count."⁵³ As the open break became more imminent (1774), Burke, Pitt, Barré, the Duke of Grafton, and others sensed the danger. "You will draw a foreign force upon you", Burke warned, "if you get in open war with the colonies."⁵⁴ "France has her full attention upon you. War is at your door", cried Chatham.⁵⁵ Barré bent his fierce looks upon the House of Commons, predicting France would not be quiet.⁵⁶ Burke pointed out again and again the reasons why the Bourbons would intervene.⁵⁷ Pamphleteers asked the

⁴⁹ Tudor, *J. Otis*, p. 126.

⁵⁰ Arch. Aff. Étr., Angleterre, vol. 475, ff. 235, 240, 263; C. DeWitt, *Thomas Jefferson* (ed. 1861), pp. 432-433.

⁵¹ Arch. Aff. Étr., Angleterre, vol. 477, ff. 349, 350; *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XXVI. 747.

⁵² Arch. Aff. Étr., Angleterre, vol. 477, ff. 349, 350; DeWitt, *T. Jefferson*, p. 56.

⁵³ Hist. MSS. Comm., *Var. Coll.*, VI. 112, 119; Fitzmaurice, *Life of Shelburne*, I. 312.

⁵⁴ Almon, *Debates*, IX. 109, 114.

⁵⁵ Hansard, *Parl. Hist.*, XVIII. 159.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, XVII. 1309.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, XVIII. 967.

rhetorical question whether France would be a peaceable spectator of British civil contentions.⁵⁸ Only the most blind of the ministerial group refused to see the menacing aspect of the French.⁵⁹

Could those who harbored a doubt that France was crouching for a spring have peered into the secret recesses of official desks at the French ministry, all incredulity would have vanished. From 1774 on, every move in British colonial affairs was chronicled by French spies who gloated over the gathering clouds. Garnier, the French ambassador in London, informed his royal master that he had solved the problem of acquiring reports of the most secret debates in the House of Commons by getting the French reporter elected to Parliament. A secretary in the Colonial Office gave, for a bribe of 500 guineas a year, the inside information there.⁶⁰ Vergennes, minister of foreign affairs after the accession of Louis XVI., counselled Garnier as to the hired agent, the Jesuit Roubaud, who reported debates in the House of Lords. "Get what you can from him," wrote Vergennes, "but use him as a post-horse which one pays for and abandons at the end of the course."⁶¹ From these spies Vergennes learned every detail of the British government's activities, Chatham's and Burke's speeches, Gage's plans, the departure of British troops, while other spies furnished reports of the work of the First Continental Congress, details of every campaign, names of generals, the country's topography, copies of every proclamation of George III., Gage, Carleton, Lord Dunmore, all of which were stored in the French archives where they lie to-day.

By July of 1775 French agents in America were reporting with ill-concealed joy that "everybody was running in crowds to the camp of liberty", that there was not a town or city in America where the majority of the inhabitants in a frenzy of war were not continually practising military manoeuvres. The French agents and the ministers in Paris were sure that the colonists would never again consent to be subjects of Great Britain.⁶² Not even French heroes could have been more highly lauded than were Arnold and Montgomery. All this the British knew, but since it was part of the policy of the government in the early days of rebellion to make the colonists believe that England was on the best terms with France this desire to

⁵⁸ *A Letter to Lord M.* (pamphlet), p. 29; [Arthur Lee], *American Appeal to Justice* (1774), p. 47.

⁵⁹ Hist. MSS. Comm., *Var. Coll.*, VI. 116, 117, 122.

⁶⁰ Arch. Aff. Étr., Angleterre, vol. 507, no. 84 (Nov. 9, 1774); vol. 511, no. 29.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, vol. 515, no. 41.

⁶² Doniol, *La Participation*, I. 12, 13.

deceive the Americans made it difficult for the British government to make effective its complaints that the French were not observing neutrality.⁶³

Nor was France the only land that looked complacently upon England's troubles. Vergennes did not greatly exaggerate when he wrote that if England looks outside to the other countries of the world—from Buenos Aires to New Orleans, from Dunkirk to the Antilles (except Portugal whose defense is only one more burden)—she sees only enemies.⁶⁴ Indeed during 1775 England seemed on the verge of war with Spain in defense of Portugal. Ralph Izard, travelling across Europe (1774-1775), wrote that the cause of America was approved by all. At Rome he found many well-wishers. The Swedish ambassador told him that he was glad to find that there was still a part of the world where tyranny was not triumphant and where the people dared virtuously to oppose its progress. Izard found the proceedings of the Continental Congress filling the French, Dutch, German, and Italian papers, which he had seen, and he was told that the same was true in Denmark, Sweden, and Russia.⁶⁵ Frederick the Great viewed "this Boston Heroism" with interest, pleased with England's troubles.⁶⁶ The Dutch were hoping for independence (1774), wrote Henry Ellis, in hopes the Americans would buy from their shop.⁶⁷

And yet the French government was not wholly happy. Vergennes was aware that the spirit of revolt, wherever it breaks out, is always a troublesome example, a moral malady which might become contagious. He feared that spirit of independence which had made so terrible an explosion in North America.⁶⁸ Then there was the fear of the British recouping any losses to their fisheries by seizing the French fishing grounds.⁶⁹ But above all was the spectre of Chatham who, "uniting great talents with a love of glory", might again arouse the English people to war on France.⁷⁰ He too might conciliate America. There was the man to fear. And should he to that end yield to the colonies the right of taxation and regulation of commerce, would he not make amends by using British sea power to seize the French West Indies, and thus regain the lost source of

⁶³ Arch. Aff. Étr., Angleterre, vol. 508, no. 129, *et al.*

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, vol. 507, no. 147.

⁶⁵ R. Izard, *Correspondence*, I. 46, 82, 126.

⁶⁶ Circourt, III. 163.

⁶⁷ Hist. MSS. Comm., *Var. Coll.*, VI. 112.

⁶⁸ Arch. Aff. Étr., Angleterre, vol. 510, no. 127.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, vol. 515, no. 45.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, vol. 510, no. 118.

revenue? Louis XVI. himself feared, more than anything else, lest Chatham should plunge the world in flames, attack France and Spain,⁷¹ in order to unite England and her colonies against the common enemy. The King of Spain fully agreed with him.

Meanwhile, in America, opinion was veering towards a hope for French aid. Faced with the prospect of war with the greatest power on earth, ancient prejudices tended to melt away. The wiser a patriot was, the less he was confident of victory without foreign aid. Franklin, while yet in London, found the French embassy there most attentive, and he did not repulse them lest his country might need them later. He began (1774) to prophesy foreign interference in America's behalf and, indeed, seems to have negotiated with merchants and armorers of Holland and France for such munitions of war as America might want.⁷² One after another (1775), Hamilton, Arthur Lee, R. H. Lee, Charles Lee, William Gordon, John and Samuel Adams, General Greene expressed confidence in French aid.⁷³ Arthur Lee thought that France looked upon no part of the world with a more attentive eye than on America. The French posture might well make the British tremble.⁷⁴ John Adams, "forced to seek the friendship of England's enemies", urged alliances with France and Spain.⁷⁵ Charles Lee was for feeling their pulse. Hamilton argued that their promises to keep quiet meant nothing, were mere finesse to hide a sinister design and would never bind longer than the temptation to break. Princes' promises were worth nothing anyway, and France would, of course, use every means to destroy British power. They might refrain from open rupture, but would use every clandestine method to aid America.⁷⁶

Soon after Lexington the public journals in America contained matter expressing faith in a French alliance. There was published a letter from an American in Paris who wrote that the French to a man were strongly in favor of America—on the "principle of humanity". Another thought France would wait until the breach between England and America was irreparable and then would come to

⁷¹ Arch. Nat., K, no. 3 (Année 1775), no. 21, no. 22.

⁷² Franklin, *Works*, ed. Sparks, IV. 396.

⁷³ *Letters of R. H. Lee*, ed. Ballagh, I. 205, 211; *Life and Speeches of Patrick Henry*, I. 383; Force, *Am. Arch.*, fourth ser., IV. 1126; J. Adams, *Works*, I. 200, II. 487; Franklin, *Works*, IV. 47, VII. 470; Frothingham, *Siege of Boston*, p. 263; Burnett, *Letters of Members of the Continental Congress*, I. 106, 107, 233, 248; Hamilton, *Works*, ed. Lodge, I. 169; Gordon, *Sermon*, p. 24.

⁷⁴ [A. Lee], *Am. Appeal to Justice*, p. 47.

⁷⁵ Burnett, *Letters*, I. 106, 107.

⁷⁶ Hamilton, *Works*, I. 169.

aid.⁷⁷ Finally, on December 12, 1775, even Congress moved to explore the likelihood of French aid. The Committee of Secret Correspondence, Franklin, Dickinson, and Jay, wrote to Arthur Lee that Congress wished to know the disposition of foreign powers, but in learning it he must use "impenetrable secrecy".⁷⁸

Meanwhile the popular imagination was pleased with delusions and anticipations. Early in 1775 colonial journals spread the tale of forty ships of war building in Sweden for the French government with an eye to the quarrel between England and America.⁷⁹ In May an imaginary French fleet had put to sea to give aid to American ships.⁸⁰ By fall the papers carried the rumor that France and Spain had a greater sea force than the British could muster in a year, that superior French and Spanish fleets were in the West Indies, that Choiseul was again in favor and would lead France and Spain at once into war with England.⁸¹ Algiers was attacked, and Gibraltar besieged by the Spanish, ran the wild rumors. By midsummer of 1776 the newspapers deluded Americans with a French general and an admiral in the West Indies ready to begin hostilities against England as soon as Congress decided upon independence.⁸²

Nor were France and Spain the only hope. Soon after Bunker Hill there were flying rumors of eight German general officers and a ship loaded with artillery and ammunition bound for America.⁸³ Two months later three German princes were said to be travelling incognito in New England hoping to aid America.⁸⁴ There was joy everywhere over the report that the King of Prussia was about to invade Hanover to collect a British debt.⁸⁵ In the hour of peril much comfort was derived from embracing these delusive phantoms of hope.

Against the growth of this American aspiration for aid from France, British pamphleteers and American Loyalists fought in vain. A pamphlet circulated in the colonies at British government expense offered friendly advice against reliance on France.⁸⁶ If America

⁷⁷ *Pennsylvania Evening Post*, Oct. 19, 1775; *Essex Gazette*, July 21, 1775; *ibid.*, Nov. 30, 1775; *Pa. Packet*, no. 147; *Cont. Journal and Weekly Advertiser*, July 11, 18, 25, 1776; *Letters on the Am. Rev.*, ed. Willard, p. 182.

⁷⁸ Burnett, *Letters*, I. 274.

⁷⁹ *Maryland Gazette*, Jan. 12, 1775; *Pa. Gazette*, Jan. 25, 1775.

⁸⁰ *Essex Gazette*, May 18, 1775.

⁸¹ *Pa. Gazette*, Sept. 13, 1775; *Essex Gazette*, Sept. 14, 1775.

⁸² *New England Chronicle*, July 11, 1776.

⁸³ *Essex Gazette*, June 29, 1775.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, Aug. 17, 1775.

⁸⁵ *Pa. Gazette*, Sept. 20, 1775.

⁸⁶ [Sir John Dalrymple], *Address by the People of Great Britain to the Inhabitants of America* (1775), p. 6.

wished the aid of France and Spain no doubt it could be got. British felicity is the envy of all nations, the author insinuated. "Slaves always hate the free." But can Americans trust such aid? "Will the despotism of France establish a new Empire of Liberty?" Will French armies conquer for America and not for themselves? "Will the Inquisition of Spain make a Protestant cause independent?" asked the pamphleteer, appealing to New England prejudice. These dark hints were reinforced by Joseph Galloway's reminder of the "danger, and all the horrors of French slavery and popish superstition". In every way he tried to recall the old American hate of France. Her ambition is still alive, he warned. Her power is asleep, but will awake. With her aid America would win independence from England only to become the slave of arbitrary power—of popish bigotry and superstition. Beware of the miseries of a foreign yoke, he pleaded.⁸⁷ Indeed, when John Adams first suggested in Congress application to Europe he got only "grimaces" and "convulsions" from the members, for whose nerves it was too much. But all warning and hesitance was in vain. These imagined terrors were nothing compared with the dismay in the heart of every reasoning American as he contemplated war with England lacking the aid of France.

After the news of Lexington and Concord had spread in ever widening circles over the sea and throughout Europe, the French government felt pressure from every side to render some kind of aid to the Americans. It was the fashion in France in those days of absolutism for men of influence in the state to sit down and write to the monarch as publicists to-day write to the public in magazines or for the Sunday supplement of a great newspaper, long articles urging their political views. These *mémoires*, hundreds of them preserved in the French foreign archives division of *Mémoires et Documents*, written by dukes, counts, nobles of every degree, great ministers of state, and intended solely for the eyes of the king and his ministers, pressed at this time the argument that the prestige and the fundamental economic interests of the French nation were at stake in the outcome of England's struggle with her colonies. The Duke de Noailles, the Count de Broglie, the Count de St. Germain, the Chevalier d'Anemours, De Magnières, and many lesser persons offered the motives of historical example, of French safety, of right or of honor, decorous mantles for everything from secret aid to brutal assault.⁸⁸ The sophisticated writers recalled that Carthage once had

⁸⁷ Joseph Galloway, *A Candid Examination* (1775), p. 46.

⁸⁸ Arch. Nat., K 157 (Broglie), ff. 128-129; *ibid.*, K 1340, no. 10, pp. 53-89; Arch. Aff. Étr., États Unis, Supp., II. series, vol. XV.; *ibid.*, États Unis, I., no. 21, ff. 69-70; *ibid.*, Angleterre, vol. 515, f. 24.

a navy, now England; that Carthage was destroyed, why not England? Others reminded the king that Queen Elizabeth gave aid to Holland in its struggle with the Duke of Alba. Like the Dutch provinces the Americans were republicans suffering impatiently and trying to shake off the yoke of domination, jealous to excess of their liberty, ready to sacrifice all to preserve it. England on the other hand was a nation rich, drunk with its success in the last war, impatient of the least resistance, resembling, indeed, the Romans dictating laws to their colonists.

Such were the arguments that reached the king, but outside the court the expression of sympathy was even more ardent. Joseph de Maistre, fired by Rousseau, cried "Liberty, insulted in Europe, has taken its flight to America, another hemisphere", and there France must protect it.⁸⁹ Citizens, philosophers, young nobles, who had found in their classics, and in Voltaire and Rousseau, enthusiasm for the cause of freedom, became patrons of the colonial rebels. Even the meagre press, published only with royal permission, gave much space to sympathetic accounts of American events.⁹⁰

In the very cabinet of the king progress was being made beyond what the impatient French society imagined. The Count de Vergennes, minister of foreign affairs, denounced in popular verse as a fool, a dolt, a tool of the British ministry, used words in 1775 much the same as Choiseul had used ten years earlier concerning England. She, the declared enemy of France, was haughty, avaricious, jealous, seeking supremacy in the four quarters of the earth. She was powerfully armed and ready to strike in a convenient moment.⁹¹ Here was the time marked out by Providence to deliver the universe from a greedy tyrant. To this end Vergennes urged not open war but secret aid. Count de St. Germain too proposed secret aid;⁹² Turgot, his face set like flint against open war, "the greatest of evils", which he declared meant financial ruin, would nevertheless favor aid which was *sub rosa*; he would shut ministerial eyes to the Americans buying ammunition in French ports.⁹³

The ministry advanced far enough to accept, in the fall of 1775, the proffered services of one Bonvouloir to go to Philadelphia.⁹⁴ He

⁸⁹ Sainte-Beuve, *Portraits Littéraires*, II. 388.

⁹⁰ L. Rosenthal, *America and France*, pp. 15-18.

⁹¹ *Journal des Savants*, 1881, p. 178; Arch. Nat., K 164, Dossier III., no. 22; Arch. Aff. Étr., Mém. et Doc., France, vol. 410, f. 119.

⁹² Arch. Aff. Étr., Angleterre, vol. 515, no. 24 (Mar. 1, 1776).

⁹³ Arch. Nat., K 1340, no. 10, pp. 53-89.

⁹⁴ Doniol, I. 510. When the British suspected this mission Vergennes instructed Garnier to say that the French government knew nothing of it, that the

met there the Secret Committee of Congress, whose five members came to a rendezvous in the dark, by different roads, to find that Bonvouloir had no right, no power. He was only "a traveller out of curiosity", but he intimated darkly, "showing his hand only a little", that Congress could get the sinews of war from France, if it would but ask. They asked him about engineers, arms and supplies, and free entrance and exit to French harbors, and whether they should send a deputy. He would say only that France wished them well, was able to furnish engineers, and that getting munitions was only a matter "between one merchant and another", that he could give addresses, and *perhaps* French officials at the ports would shut their eyes. Yet, he insists, he made no advances, gave no guaranty, "*absolutely* nothing". As to a deputy, "it was slippery business in the face of the English".⁹⁵ Evasive, clandestine, underground as the French approaches were, Congress took heart at last and on March 2, 1776, sent Silas Deane as an agent to buy supplies in France.⁹⁶

On his arrival in Paris early in July, the British at once knew his name, his lodgings, and the purpose of his visit. Two powerful English diplomats were sent to counteract him, and the city "swarmed with Englishmen", it seemed to Deane.⁹⁷ He was filled with "heart-rending anxiety", for at the head of the French ministry he found "no daring genius", and though pleasantly received saw poor prospects for accomplishing his mission.

Fortunately for Deane and the American cause the cautious French king and his ministry had already been led across the bridge of doubt, in part by public opinion, in part by the tireless zeal and infectious enthusiasm of Caron de Beaumarchais, who was the spirit of Benvenuto Cellini reborn in the eighteenth century. Though sharing at times even the moral standards of his prototype, Beaumarchais with all his love of intrigue had a certain nobility of character, an heroic fervor for the cause of freedom. This brilliant writer of plays, one of the most fascinating figures that history records, had risen by his own talents from the humble home of a king's "delicacy and sense of justice would prevent such an act", and that he was anxious to do his whole duty as a good neighbor. Arch. Aff. Étr., Angleterre, vol. 515, no. 45.

⁹⁵ Durand, *Docs. on the Am. Rev.*, pp. 2-16.

⁹⁶ G. L. Clark, *Silas Deane*, p. 38 (facsimile of commission). Frenchmen were already bargaining with the Secret Committee to supply military stores "by connivance". Burnett, *Letters of Members of the Continental Congress*, I. 299, 304, 341, 367.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 50-51.

watchmaker to a position of influence even in the superb court of Louis XVI. He had been sent on a delicate mission in 1775 to England to recover from the notorious Chevalier d'Eon papers which in his hands were dangerous to the French state. He was wholly successful, outwitted "this fiery and deceitful creature", who confessed to having been in disguise for twenty years, and who now became a "crazy woman", crazy over Beaumarchais, who laughed at having to play "gallant cavalier" to this "capitaine de dragons", this woman, who, nevertheless, "drank and smoked and swore like a German trooper". While engaged in this wild romance Beaumarchais, in the home of John Wilkes in London—a home haunted by friends of America—met Arthur Lee, and through him first touched the pulse of American life. Only a spark was necessary to fire his sympathetic nature. In a moment he became almost idolatrous of the cause of his "dear Americans", clapping his hands and triumphing over every victory, trembling lest the pleas he offered in behalf of America be denied. To both Vergennes and the French king he sent letter after letter, amazingly audacious, reminding the king that he was responsible to God, to himself, and to a great people for his decision. He even prayed the Guardian Angel of the state for just a half-hour audience with the king.

In these appeals he exhausted every argument and every sophistry to win Louis XVI. from his scruples even against secret aid. Did he owe most to the proud English or to his own people, Beaumarchais asked? Let the king beware of a deplorable excess of equity towards his enemies, urged the author of *Figaro*. Let him remember that the policy of governments is not the moral law of its citizens. Were men angels, counselled the Barber of Seville, political ways might be disclaimed. Moreover, let the king reflect that a kingdom is a vast isolated body, further removed from its neighbors by a diversity of interests than by the sea, the citadels, and the barriers which bound it. Beaumarchais appealed to Athens and to Solon—to the wisdom of all the ages. As to his duty the king must understand that though strict and vigorous in its performance to his own people, to other nations his duty was only conventional. He taunted the king with Dunkirk, with his impotence before the partition of Poland, with the perfidious British seizure of five hundred French vessels at the opening of the last war. He recalled the lost provinces in America and pointed the danger of further losses. Is France again to become the victim of England and the laughing-stock of Europe, he asked. In the name of the glory and prosperity of his reign, Beaumarchais implored his royal master, let him realize the

"facility of doing, the certainty of success, the immense harvest of glory and tranquillity". The only really important matter now, he cried, is America and all that pertains to it. Thus he forced on the kingly attention "the famous quarrel between America and England which is soon going to divide the world".⁹⁸

Since French finances seemed to preclude open war, secret aid was the one solution indicated. That would bring the fruits of a great victory without the danger of combat. Then, to clinch all other arguments, Beaumarchais, after meeting Arthur Lee in London, audaciously wrote the king: "*We must aid the Americans*", to save our own West Indies. Lee had declared that the Continental Congress had authorized him to demand a treaty of commerce with France in order that America might get from her the munitions of war without which defeat was certain. Should France refuse, Lee threatened, America must yield to England, and then, that the two parts of the empire might become reconciled by fighting side by side, they would unite in an attack on the French and Spanish West Indies. It is impossible to determine whether Lee or Beaumarchais invented this amazing threat, but it was just the menace to have the greatest effect with the French ministry. Over and over again that frightful portent had appeared in reports and *mémoires* familiar to every member of the ministry. De Kalb prophesied it in his report in 1768.⁹⁹ St. Germain twice raised the spectre in his *mémoires* to the king. "The ease of conquest would suggest the idea," he wrote, "the excuses are easy to find." Only thus could England recoup her losses.¹⁰⁰ Turgot had the same vision, fearing most for Martinique and Porto Rico. Only thus could the government hide its shame from the English nation.¹⁰¹ Indeed, John Adams had intimated as much in the Continental Congress, though that could not have been known to the French ministry.¹⁰²

Pressing the Lee story with all his fiery zeal, Beaumarchais urged the king, urged Vergennes. France could escape war only by advancing money for secret aid.¹⁰³ On March 17 and again in May of 1776, Vergennes himself proposed "veiled and hidden aid to ap-

⁹⁸ The letters in which these arguments appear are to be found *passim* in volume I. of Doniol and in Loménie's *Beaumarchais*, but they are most conveniently brought together in Miss E. Kite's *Beaumarchais*, II. 21-90.

⁹⁹ Kapp, *Kalb*, p. 64.

¹⁰⁰ Arch. Aff. Étr., Angleterre, vol. 515, no. 24.

¹⁰¹ Arch. Nat., K 1340, no. 10, p. 42; *ibid.*, f. 5.

¹⁰² J. Adams, *Works*, II. 487-488. Frederick the Great, too, had forecast such an action by the British. Circourt, III. 63.

¹⁰³ Doniol, I. 515.

pear to come from Commerce".¹⁰⁴ Beaumarchais promised to prevent such aid becoming "a firebrand between France and England". Long before the ministry made its fateful decision Beaumarchais had offered his services, and when a million livres was ventured it was Beaumarchais to whom it was entrusted to found the merchant house of "Hortalez and Company", on rue Vieille-du-Temple in Paris, which straightway took all the risks of a private merchant and supplied American needs through the risky channels of a pretended commerce. As one reads the documents in this matter one must be convinced that Beaumarchais furnished the brains, the intellect, the tireless energy which pushed the French ministry into action. His activity was not a fundamental cause, but was the actual occasion.

Thus it was that the French government was brought to the decision to give secret aid to America in a time of direst need. Too little attention has been given in our histories to this secret aid which preceded by more than eighteen months the treaty of alliance and open aid. Washington's victory at Trenton and Princeton was doubtless made possible by the supplies furnished by the French or through their instigation. But the outstanding fact is that the battle of Saratoga, won, it is true, by American soldiers, but won with ammunition and guns of which ninety per cent. were obtained through French channels, became itself the final encouragement and the cause of the French delusion which determined Louis XVI. and his ministry to reach the great resolution to enter the war on the American side. That resolution determined that the United States of America should become in 1783 one of the independent nations of the world.

C. H. VAN TYNE.

¹⁰⁴ Flassan, *Hist. de la Dipl. Française*, VI. 143, 144; Arch. Nat., K 164, no. 3, Vergennes Corr., 1776, no. 9.

THE POOR WHITES OF THE ANTE-BELLUM SOUTH

I.

THOUGH life in the old South was in many respects complex, yet fundamentally a "peculiar institution" dominated the domestic, industrial, and political activity of all classes. It was apparent that a peaceful continuance of the controlling influence of slavery could last only as long as there existed a common belief among non-slaveholders that their relation to a system of slave labor rested upon a basis of mutual advantage. The dominant race had been held together by a class consciousness which seemed more vital than the differences which separated it into groups of slaveholders, yeomen farmers, artisans, and poor whites. Towards the close of the ante-bellum period, however, obvious defects of an undiversified economy caused a re-examination of industrial society, and in the process the antagonisms latent in the relations of the various elements of the white population came to the surface. As a consequence there took shape a movement of discontent which promised to wrest political leadership from the hands of the gentry and overthrow the industrial monopoly of the plantation system.

It remained for Hinton Rowan Helper to express this "impending crisis" in its extreme form.¹ He declared that an ineradicable class antagonism separated those who owned slaves from those who owned none. Describing himself as one of the non-slaveholders he urged his fellow-sufferers to rise in revolt, cast off the yoke of the "planting oligarchy", and govern according to their own class interests.² Helper's appeal met with no response among the non-slaveholders. Many of them were illiterate, and the book had only a limited circulation in the South. Yet this obvious explanation should not obscure the fact that Helper was proceeding on a false assumption. Moderate reformers, men like De Bow, William Gregg, and Governor Hammond, had long been studying the problem of Southern industry. From their experience one is impressed with the belief that instead of a clear-cut issue between the slaveholders and non-slaveholders, the latter group itself rested on a congeries of complex interests which prevented the development of a class consciousness that could be directed against the institution of slavery.

¹ H. R. Helper, *The Impending Crisis of the South* (New York, 1857).

² *Ibid.*, pp. 28, 32, 120-121, 155 ff.

It is necessary to view the non-slaveholding element in the light of its complex composition. The province of this paper is the life, attitude, and social significance of the most wretched portion of the population. The poor whites of the ante-bellum South were at the very bottom of society. Yet their presence went far in affecting the course of Southern history in the period before the Civil War, as their regeneration since then has been a characteristic feature of the rise of a New South.

II.

The South contained a number of areas which stood out in significant isolation as the habitat of the poor whites. In Georgia such a district was found in the pine barrens of the south-central portion of the state whose insularity was accentuated by a tier of black-belt counties which surrounded it. In the amount of cotton and corn produced, property in live stock, and cash value of farms, the poor white counties were far outstripped by their more fortunate neighbors.³ The region of the pine barrens was also completely detached from the centres where manufactures either had been established or were beginning.⁴ Mississippi, likewise, had a well-defined poor white area. East of the Pearl River a barren section of pine woods formed a distinct portion of the state known as East Mississippi, the home of the "hill-billies", "sand-hillers", and "clay-eaters". In the western portion of the state, on the fertile bottom-lands of the Mississippi River and its tributaries, the plantation system had been established in an advanced form. Between these two districts there was great disparity in the per capita distribution of wealth, the average white of the black belt exceeding in wealth the average inhabitant of East Mississippi by ten to fifteen times.⁵ Similarly in South Carolina, Alabama, and Florida, "sand-hillers" and "clay-eaters" were to be found living in clusters through the pine woods, the abandoned clay bottoms, and the unproductive sand-hills.

Scattered through these barrens the poor whites lived in isolated communities remote from centres of trade and untouched by the normal currents of Southern life.⁶ Infrequently traversed roads might with difficulty be traced through the wild, sparsely settled

³ *Census of 1860, Agriculture*, pp. 26-28.

⁴ In no poor white county except Charlton, where 184 hands were employed in the turpentine industry, did the census reports indicate more than 50 hands employed in manufactures. *Census of 1860, Manufactures*, pp. 61-79, 80-81, 82.

⁵ Comparison based on statistics gathered from the *Census of 1860*.

⁶ D. R. Hundley, *Social Relations in our Southern States* (New York, 1860), p. 258. Hundley was a Southerner of the planting class.

country, but these paths were "almost overgrown with grass, and so dim and blind that the traveller almost unconsciously wanders from them into the forest".⁷ The land was of slight value, and its lack of fertility made agriculture a doubtful venture. Consequently the land was in no demand from productive society, and the poor white had no difficulty in finding a small tract upon which he could live unmolested.⁸

Here he would build a rude cabin of round logs in the typical backwoods manner. "A few rickety chairs, a long bench, a dirty bed or two, a spinning-wheel, . . . a skillet, an oven, a frying-pan, a triangular cupboard in one corner and a rack . . . [for] the family rifle"⁹ might serve as an inventory of the contents of the cabin's single room. Food could be procured with a minimum of effort. "Wild hogs, deer, wild turkeys, squirrels, raccoons, opossums—these and many more are at [the] very doors [of the poor whites]; and they have only to pick up 'old Silver Heels' [the rifle], walk a few miles out into the forest, and return home laden with enough meat to last them a week."¹⁰ The yield of their rifles and fishing rods might be supplemented by corn and potatoes from their straggling gardens.¹¹ Altogether it was a life without much effort and it produced a class of lazy, idle men who gained a universal reputation for shiftlessness.¹²

As a rule the poor whites were illiterate and ignorant.¹³ The undeveloped educational system of the South did not extend into the

⁷ Augusta *Constitutionalist*, Oct. 18, 1831, as quoted in U. B. Phillips, *Plantation and Frontier*, II. 167 (*Documentary History of American Industrial Society*, Cleveland, 1910). Cf. Olmsted's experience, F. L. Olmsted, *A Journey in the Seaboard Slave States* (New York, 1856), pp. 63 ff.

⁸ Squatting was common among the poor white class. Hundley, *Social Relations*, pp. 119, 271; G. Weston, *The Progress of Slavery in the United States* (Washington, 1857), p. 39.

⁹ Hundley, *Social Relations*, p. 260.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 261–262.

¹¹ James Stirling, *Letters from the Slave States* (London, 1857), p. 224; Hundley, *Social Relations*, p. 261.

¹² Olmsted, *Seaboard Slave States*, pp. 506–508; Cairnes, *Slave Power*, p. 369; *De Bow's Review*, XVII. 363; Hundley describes the poor whites as "the laziest two-legged animals that walk erect on the face of the earth. Even their motions are slow, and their speech is a sickening drawl . . . while their thoughts and ideas seem likewise to creep along at a snail's pace. All they seem to care for is to live from hand to mouth; to get drunk, . . . ; to shoot for beef; to attend gander pullings; to vote at elections; to eat and sleep; to lounge in the sunshine of a bright summer's day, and to bask in the warmth of a roaring wood fire, when summer days are over". *Social Relations*, pp. 263–264.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 265.

remote districts where they made their homes,¹⁴ while their own inertia formed an effective barrier to the extension of reform.¹⁵ The ignorance of the class had far-reaching results, giving birth to prejudices which made it easy to acquiesce in slavery at a time when others were pointing to that institution as the cause of the poor whites' degeneracy.¹⁶ It is not certain that education would have altered greatly the situation. Gilmore, reflecting the opinion of most Northern and European travellers, stated that destruction of slavery would follow inevitably the education of the poor whites.¹⁷ On the other hand, Fitzhugh averred that if the poor man were educated and given "respectable employment" (*i.e.*, work artificially closed to slaves by law) he would become "a noble and privileged character and he would then like the negroes and slavery because his high position would be due to them".¹⁸ The foreign observer was apt to be blind to the social and economic relations existing between the poor white and the slave, and the importance to the former of maintaining the system of slavery to safeguard his own self-respect. If education were to bring power it is logical to assume that such power might be employed in asserting a superiority that had little basis of fact once slavery was abolished and artificial restraints swept aside.

Perhaps the most regrettable habit of the poor white was that of eating clay. How prevalent this disease was it is impossible to ascertain. Lyell, the English scientist, believed it to be common among the poor whites of the lower South.¹⁹ Occasional references to the "dirt-eaters" and "clay-eaters" are found in scattered sources. As illustrative of this sort of evidence a conversation between a Northern traveller and his negro guide may be quoted:

"Are there many of these poor whites around Georgetown [S. C.]?"

"Not many 'round Georgetown, sar, but great many in de up-country har, and dey'm all 'like—pore and no account; none ob 'em kin read, and dey all eat clay."

"Eat clay!" I said; "What do you mean by that?"

"Didn't you see, massa, how yaller all dem wimmin war? Dat's 'cause dey eat clay. De little children begin 'fore dey kin walk, and dey

¹⁴ De Bow, *Resources of the Southern and Western States* (New Orleans, 1852-1853), I. 71, 246; Olmsted, *Back Country*, pp. 25, 40, 331-337; Helper, *Impending Crisis*, p. 288.

¹⁵ Cairnes, *Slave Power*, p. 153, note, quoting William Gregg.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 143-144; Weston, *Progress of Slavery*, pp. 39-48, 203-204.

¹⁷ Gilmore, *Among the Pines*, pp. 175-176.

¹⁸ Fitzhugh, *Sociology for the South*, p. 148.

¹⁹ Charles Lyell, *Second Visit to the United States of North America* (New York and London, 1849), II. 17.

eat it till dey die; dey chaw it like 'backer. It makes all dar stumacs big, like as you seed 'em, and spiles dar 'gestion. It'm mighty onhealfy."²⁰

Years after the period of this study dirt-eating, the anemic, milky complexions, and the stupid, lazy attitude of the poor whites were discovered to be symptoms of chronic suffering from the hookworm disease (uncinariasis). In 1902 Dr. Charles Wardell Stiles succeeded in demonstrating the prevalence of the malady in the rural, sandy districts of the South, the areas in which the poor whites had been living for generations.²¹ This "poor man's malady", the most common illness of the infected districts, was the true cause of "much of the trouble popularly attributed to 'dirt-eating', 'resin-chewing', and even some of the proverbial laziness of the poorer classes of the white population".²²

One has only to compare the description of the ante-bellum poor white with Dr. Stiles's symptoms of hookworm disease to realize that the people living on the same ground in the years before 1860 were suffering from the same trouble as their descendants in 1902. Henry Ker in 1816 when speaking of complexions that were of "a yellow sickly cast"²³ was describing the same phenomena that Stiles pictured as "anemic, waxy-white to a yellow or tan, shrivelled, parchment-like or tallow appearance".²⁴ The sand-hiller—"lank, lean, angular, and bony, with flaming red, or flaxen, or sandy, or carroty-colored hair, sallow complexion, awkward manners, and a natural stupidity or dullness of intellect that almost surpasses belief"—who crossed Hundley's pages,²⁵ was of the same species as the thin, pot-bellied figures with drawn faces who recently stepped up to the field dispensaries of the Rockefeller Foundation to be cured of uncinariasis.²⁶ Gilmore's "dirt-eaters"²⁷ were satisfying "an abnormal appetite due to the anemia and abnormal condition of the intestinal tract",²⁸ which marks the advanced stages of chronic hookworm disease. If then we are to conclude that to some extent at least the

²⁰ Gilmore, *Among the Pines*, p. 82.

²¹ C. W. Stiles, *Report upon the Prevalence and Geographic Distribution of Hookworm Disease in the United States* [Treasury Dept. Hygienic Laboratory, Bulletin no. 10] (Washington, 1903).

²² *Ibid.*, p. 36.

²³ Henry Ker, *Travels through the Western Interior of the United States* (Elizabethtown, N. J., 1816), p. 352.

²⁴ Stiles, *op. cit.*, p. 59.

²⁵ Hundley, *Social Relations*, pp. 264-265.

²⁶ Rockefeller Sanitary Commission for the Eradication of Hookworm Disease, *Publications* (Washington, 1910-1915).

²⁷ Gilmore, *Among the Pines*, p. 82.

²⁸ Stiles, *op. cit.*, p. 76.

ante-bellum poor whites were suffering from a disease which weakened them in mind and body, we must be ready to modify the extreme statements of contemporaries who condemned these "degenerates, the children of ancient poverty and wrong",²⁹ as personally accountable for their destitution.³⁰

The poverty, ignorance, and shiftless outlook on life characteristic of the class are the outgrowth of an environment of barren soils and isolated stagnation. The road to the true frontier, towards progress and independence, was barred by the plantation belt which enclosed many of the poor white areas. An inert contentment with their lot had also developed in a group long accustomed to fill no place in productive society. This will become evident after an examination of the relation of the poor whites to the Southern industrial organization.

III.

The poor white class was the 'slum element of the South. This fact the South never fully accepted. The harsh condemnation of Northern and European critics that it constituted a rotten core in Southern society was passed over as foreign prejudice and had little effect upon Southern thought.³¹ Several factors contributed in producing the complacency with which the typical Southerner viewed the presence of the poor white class. The absence of continued contact between the responsible elements of society and the poor whites, coupled with the total lack of discontent on the part of the latter, which, if present, might have compelled consideration of the problem, made for ignorance and neglect of its existence. Southern society considered itself exceptionally favored with a remarkably small pauper class and failed to see suffering as striking as that which fell

²⁹ Ingle, *Southern Sidelights*, p. 24.

³⁰ See the next note.

³¹ Frances A. (Kemble) Butler wrote that the poor white class was "the most degraded race of human beings claiming an Anglo-Saxon origin that can be found on the face of the earth—filthy, lazy, ignorant, brutal, proud, penniless savages without one of the nobler attributes which have been found occasionally allied to the vices of savage nature". *Journal of a Residence on a Georgian Plantation, in 1838-1839* (New York, 1863), p. 146. Olmsted approximates this in *The Cotton Kingdom*, I. 13, 83. This group of critics exaggerated, no doubt, but the contempt of Southern planters frequently led to equally harsh condemnation. Thus Hundley was puzzled to "comprehend for what purpose the miserable wretches were ever allowed to obtain a footing in this country". *Social Relations*, pp. 265-266. The foreigner tended to hold the system responsible for the degradation of the class while the Southerner attributed it to individual failures.

to the lot of the working-classes of the North and of England.³² Neither suffering nor poor relief, however, was the criterion by which the poverty of the South was to be appraised. It had its own peculiarities, and these were the product of the organization of industrial society. The plantation system by virtually monopolizing industry rendered superfluous the potential labor contribution of the poor white, consigning him to a life of uselessness so far as productive society was concerned. Economically the class was not directly exploited by others, but its unutilized capacities presented a serious indictment.

The planter justified his neglect by declaring the poor whites irresponsible, lazy, and dishonest, attributes rendering them valueless as laborers. Hundley expressed this point of view when he declared that "there is no longer any possible method by which they can be weaned from leading the lives of vagrom-men, idlers, and squatters, useless to themselves and the rest of mankind".³³ This contempt of their capacities was shared by the middle classes and the slaves. A "Charleston working man" flatteringly bestowed upon "the whiskey-drinking, potatoe-raising, charcoal burning Sand-hillers . . . intellect enough for the delightful employment of hammering granite", and thus, he believed, they could be induced to do the state some service.³⁴ A Northern critic, holding the thesis that free labor would ultimately supplant slave labor in the South, was convinced that the free labor would have to be imported from free communities. He had no expectation of the poor whites accomplishing this end. As a class they "were shiftless, ignorant, and degraded" to such an extent that they would be no match for the slaveholder.³⁵ The poor whites met on all sides an overwhelming distrust of their capacities,³⁶ the defense reaction of a society in which they, as a productive factor, were superfluous.

Prejudice was an additional consideration preventing the employment of the class in the plantation system. The planter had

a natural distaste to exchange absolute for partial authority over the instruments by which he achieves his purpose; and the employment of free

³² Hundley, *Social Relations*, p. 261; Fitzhugh, *Sociology for the South*, pp. 27-28; *id.*, *Cannibals All*, *passim*.

³³ Hundley, *Social Relations*, p. 119; see also Olmsted, *Seaboard Slave States*, pp. 82-83.

³⁴ *De Bow's Review*, IX, 435 (October, 1850). The negro despised the poor whites as "pore trash. Dat's what de big folks call 'em, and it am true; dey'm long way lower down dan de darkies". Gilmore, *Among the Pines*, p. 83.

³⁵ Weston, *Progress of Slavery*, p. 18. Cairnes shared this view; *The Slave Power*, p. 141.

³⁶ Olmsted, *Cotton Kingdom*, I, 11-12, 83, 92-97, 189, 196.

and slave labour together, is almost as difficult as working, under the same yoke, an unbroken horse and a docile ox. Again, however repugnant it may be to the self-esteem, and contrary to the habits of the rich man to treat his labourers with respect, he has to do it when employing white men, from motives of self-interest which lie below the surface, and he consequently habitually avoids arranging his affairs in such a way as will make it necessary for him to offer them employment.³⁷

Because they might leave their jobs at any time³⁸ and because it was impossible to drive them,³⁹ white laborers were not as desirable on the plantation as slaves. Those poor whites remaining in the plantation areas were the cause of much worry to the planter. He considered their presence as demoralizing to the slaves,⁴⁰ charged them with stealing from the plantation and supplying the negroes with whiskey.⁴¹ Consequently the planter often felt it necessary to encourage the poor whites to seek homes elsewhere.⁴²

It was virtually the unanimous opinion of men from without the South and of many within that labor was considered disreputable because it was performed by slaves. From this premise it was reasoned that the poor white, sharing the disdain for labor, refused to work unless compelled to do so from necessity. "To work industriously . . .", wrote Olmsted, "is, in the Southern tongue, to 'work like a nigger'; and, from childhood, the one thing in their condition which has made life valuable to the mass of whites has been that the niggers are yet their inferiors."⁴³ Tocqueville⁴⁴ and Cairnes⁴⁵ repeated the observation, while some Southerners spoke of making labor "respectable" by a classification which would restrict the employment of negroes to "such callings as are unbecoming to white men", permitting the whites alone to engage in the professions, mechanic arts, and commerce.⁴⁶ From different motives, but to the same end, were the protests of white mechanics and masons against employing negroes in the trades.⁴⁷

The existence of the prejudice against engaging in labor disgraced by slavery, however, can easily be overstated and its effect upon the idleness of the poor white class exaggerated. More frequently the

³⁷ Olmsted, *Cotton Kingdom*, pp. 22-23.

³⁸ Phillips, *Plantation and Frontier*, II. 183; Lyell, *Second Visit*, II. 126.

³⁹ Olmsted, *Seaboard Slave States*, p. 84.

⁴⁰ *Id.*, *Cotton Kingdom*, I. 330-331.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, I. 83, 109.

⁴² *Ibid.*, I. 331.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, I. 22.

⁴⁴ Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, II. 223.

⁴⁵ Cairnes, *The Slave Power*, p. 77.

⁴⁶ Fitzhugh, *Sociology for the South*, p. 147.

⁴⁷ Phillips, *Plantation and Frontier*, II. 360-361, 364, 367.

prejudice was used as an extenuation for idleness caused by other factors.⁴⁸ Southern society as it was organized before the Civil War provided no position that the poor white could fill that was not already being satisfactorily filled by others. Consequently no pressure of public opinion arising from the need of realizing his potentialities stimulated him to abandon his easy, stagnant mode of living. The planter, satisfied with the plantation system, defending it ardently as the crisis approached, unwilling to initiate a diversification of industry, contemptuous of the poor white's capacities, was not concerned in the existence of a lower class that was unobtrusive and contented, whose chief sins were idleness and shiftlessness. And the poor white, simple in mind and attitude, was content to bask in the sunlight of indifference.⁴⁹

IV.

The possibility that the poor whites might improve their position by engaging in profitable employment in manufactures was scarcely more than an academic question before 1860. There had long existed an antipathy in the South toward manufactures that was only beginning to give way before the plea for diversification as a factor in the development of Southern nationalism. In the cotton states the advocacy of manufactures "was looked upon locally as more or

⁴⁸ Hundley pointed to the fact that the supposedly universal prejudice did not affect the yeoman farmers. They not only worked their own farms but when prosperous enough to own a slave or two were even to be found laboring side by side at the same tasks with their human chattels. *Social Relations*, pp. 195-196. In another place after maintaining that the labor of the mechanic was respected in the South he declared, "It is respectable to labor—to acquire an honest livelihood by one's own industry—all the world over; but where, we should like to know, is it considered genteel or fashionable?" *Ibid.*, pp. 120-121. The yeoman farmers and the mechanics of the South were important elements in Southern industry and were consequently more respected. The poor whites alone were the outcasts.

⁴⁹ As Southern economists began to see the necessity of diversification there was some consideration of making the poor white class a productive factor by utilizing its labor. Consequently an embryonic public opinion was shaping which, had it continued to develop in the ante-bellum period, might have created the force which would have drawn the poor whites into industrial society. As it was, however, no opportunity was presented to the group as a class of leaving their isolation. Governor Hammond of South Carolina remarked that such labor as the poor whites could find was not remunerative enough to occupy them. Helper, *Impending Crisis*, p. 165. De Bow believed that a demand for the labor of the class would raise it from want and beggary. *Resources*, I, 241. One contributor to the work just cited wrote that "the acquisition of . . . wealth appeared so difficult [to the poor whites] that they decline the hopeless pursuit, and many . . . become the almost passive subjects of all its consequences". *Ibid.*, II, 108.

less treasonable in that it implied some slight belief in tariff and the rightfulness of protection".⁵⁰ Towards the end of the ante-bellum period, however, a tendency towards diversification of industry was evident and much was said of the possibility of manufactures in the South.⁵¹ In spite of the propaganda carried on by the press and commercial conventions, Southern manufactures remained insignificant to the close of the period.⁵² As late as 1860, William Gregg saw little progress and was still endeavoring "to show that all the failures of manufacturing establishments in the South have been mainly the result of the absence of Southern patronage".⁵³ To the end the South remained but little interested in any organization of industry except the slave plantation system.

The revolution in industry came after the Civil War, and consequently the poor white was not affected in the period of this study. There were, however, isolated experiments some of which affected small groups of poor whites and suggested the ultimate regeneration of the class. One of these experiments was begun in 1833 in the pine woods north of Montgomery, Alabama, by Daniel Pratt, a native of the North. Factories for the manufacture of cotton gins and cotton goods were constructed, the business flourished, and a thriving town, Prattsville, developed. The employees were white people—men, women, and children, from the surrounding country. The homes of the operatives were furnished by the company at a small rent, and schools and churches were constructed for their use. The total population amounted to eight hundred, one-fourth of whom were engaged in the factories. The poor whites were brought together in a compact community for self-improvement. The result was that the narrowness and unprogressiveness, as well as the poverty, of their former position tended to disappear. Socially their previously utter insignificance gave way to useful employment.⁵⁴

William Gregg operated several cotton factories, the one at Graniteville, South Carolina, having the reputation of being the finest and probably the largest in the South.⁵⁵ He had marked con-

⁵⁰ Channing, *History of the United States*, V. 76.

⁵¹ The movement can be traced especially in *De Bow's Review*.

⁵² The Southern cotton factories in 1860 had 290,000 spindles, as compared with 5,236,000 for the United States. Clark, *History of Manufactures*, p. 558. The proportion of the Southern population engaged in manufacturing was 1 to 82, as compared with 1 to 8 in New England, 1 to 15 in the Middle states, and 1 to 48 in the Western states. *Ibid.*, p. 580.

⁵³ *De Bow's Review*, XXIX. 77 (July, 1860).

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, XI. 102 (July, 1851); *ibid.*, IV. 136 (September, 1847).

⁵⁵ Clark, *History of Manufactures*, pp. 556-557.

victions concerning the poor white class in its relation to industry. He attributed its destitution to the organization of industry which deprived the poor white of a means of livelihood. "My experience at Graniteville", he wrote, "has satisfied me, that unless our poor people can be brought together in villages, and some means of employment afforded them, it will be an utterly hopeless effort to undertake to educate them."⁵⁶ He argued for the investment of a portion of Southern capital in a type of industry that would give employment to the poor whites, thus providing them responsible positions in society. His factory was organized on this basis and from his experience one concludes that ignorance, shiftlessness, and contentment with poverty were not inherent qualities of the poor white class but the results of a meaningless existence. Gregg himself was confident that employment would raise the poor white to a position of intelligence, thrift, and usefulness.⁵⁷

V.

The rôle of the poor white in Southern politics was definitely circumscribed by characteristics of his environment and position. His geographic, social, and economic segregation from the remainder of society was a factor of primary significance in affecting his exercise of the suffrage. The isolation in such areas as East Mississippi and the Georgian pine woods gave the class an element of compactness and cohesion the attainment of which by other means was prevented by ignorance, lack of leadership, and inertia. In much the same manner the social and economic ostracism of the class suggested a class interest that was at times kindled by the harangues on democracy by the backwoods demagogue.

The prejudices of the poor white were expressed first in terms of the slave and then in terms of democracy. The economic barrier between the poor white and the negro was weak and only artificially maintained, so that from it sprang a rational self-interest in the poor

⁵⁶ *De Bow's Review*, XI. 135-136 (August, 1851).

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, XXI. 624 (November, 1860); *ibid.*, VII. 356-357 (November, 1849).

A natural development in Alabama tends to reinforce this conclusion. In the 'fifties the pine forests of central Alabama, heretofore untouched commercially, were exploited for turpentine. "The same pine wood heretofore inhabited by a population distinguished alone for their ignorance and poverty, living almost entirely by the rifle, may now be seen bearing an industrious, well-fed and well-clad people, adding not only to their own comfort by their labor, but elevating themselves into a sober, moral, and intelligent class of citizens, contributing in no small degree to the strength and wealth of the State." Mr. Prince's report to the Mobile convention of 1854, as quoted in *De Bow's Review*, XVIII. 189 (February, 1855).

white, expressed in a strong personal hatred for the negro and a firm conviction that slavery was essential. Hundley and Olmsted, Stirling and De Bow, Helper and Fitzhugh had this at least in common; they all recognized the strength and depth of the poor white's attachment to slavery.⁵⁸ His racial prejudices limited the extent to which he would follow in attacking the social order.⁵⁹ Fundamentally his actions would be guided by an interest to preserve the institution of slavery and, whereas the wealthy planter would endeavor to keep the issue out of politics and let things slumber, the politician who sought the votes of the poor white class would be keen to urge violent resistance to the enemies of slavery, to flatter the poor white by condemning the slave.⁶⁰

The democratic prejudices of the poor white areas were similar to those of the backwoods generally and the methods used by the astute American politician are to be found in the history, past or present, of any American city or countryside. Franklin E. Plummer found in the poor whites of East Mississippi a fertile field for his resourceful enterprise. On one of his contests he and a competitor, Judge Cage, agreed to canvass the pine woods together. At one place they stopped at a cabin for dinner. The judge immediately ingratiated himself with the mother by kissing the little girl. But when the astonished parent saw the redoubtable Plummer pick up her "wee toddling boy, lay it gently across his lap, turn over its

⁵⁸ "The poorest and humblest freeman of the South feels as sensibly, perhaps more sensibly than the wealthiest planter, the barrier which nature, as well as law, has erected between the white and black races, and would scorn as much to submit to the universal degradation which must follow, whenever it is broken down." De Bow, *Resources*, III. 35. See also Hundley, *Social Relations*, p. 274; Helper, *The Impending Crisis*, pp. 42-43; Olmsted, *The Cotton Kingdom*, II. 110-111; Stirling, *Letters*, p. 86; Fitzhugh, *Cannibals All*, p. 320.

⁵⁹ At times the poor white might vaguely ponder over the effect of slavery on his life. He seldom, however, went beyond expressing a wish that things were different and ended with a sense of helplessness to alter conditions. "I wish there warn't no niggers here", he would say. "They are a great cuss to this country, I expect. But 'twouldn't do to free 'em; that wouldn't do nohow." Olmsted, *Cotton Kingdom*, II. 110. "I'd like it if we could get rid on 'em to yonst", another would remark. "I wouldn't like to hev 'em freed, if they was gwine to hang 'round. . . . Now suppose they was free, you see they'd all think themselves just as good as we." *Ibid.*, I. 289.

⁶⁰ Consequently the poor white districts were chiefly democratic, a fact which amused Hundley (*Social Relations*, pp. 265-266), and irritated Helper (*Impending Crisis*, p. 172). The adherence of the poor white areas to the "fire-eating" party is shown in an examination of the political maps in A. C. Cole, *Whig Party in the South*, and in Phillips, *State Rights in Georgia*.

little petticoat, and go to hunting red bugs . . . she was enchanted, and never forgot that tender hearted Congressman".⁶¹

But Plummer's genius for getting votes was capable of far greater flights. He knew exactly how to play upon the emotions of his constituents. One day, Powhatan Ellis, United States senator and minister to Mexico, a Democrat but aristocratic in appearance and habits, invaded Plummer's bailiwick. In crossing a creek Ellis lost his portmanteau. Immediately Plummer saw an opportunity of crushing a rival and published the following advertisement in the Monticello paper. "Lost by Hon. Powhattan Ellis, in crossing Tallahala: 6 lawn handkerchiefs; 6 cambric shirts; 2 night do.; 1 night-cap; 1 pr. stays; 4 pr. silk stockings; hair brush, flesh-brush, nail-brush, clothes-brush, razors, and dressing-glass, pomatum, perfume, etc., etc." ⁶² Commenting on this a Mississippi historian states, "That advertisement killed the Judge east of the Pearl river; such a sample of 'swelled head' effeminacy and Natchez dandyism was not wanted in the piney woods." ⁶³ Plummer's cry of "Plummer for the people, the people for Plummer", his invective, and blunt ridicule of the aristocracy kept East Mississippi solidly behind him. He succeeded in constructing a strong and compact machine which kept him in office and enabled him to exert much influence in state politics.⁶⁴

Instances of similar nature were to be found elsewhere. One politician confessed to an English traveller that although he possessed a horse he always travelled on foot through the pine woods to impress the poor whites with his democratic deportment.⁶⁵ A representative to the Alabama legislature from a poor white district was defeated in seeking re-election because his ambitious daughter had worn a dress with flounces according to the latest Parisian fashion, whence arose the report that she was holding herself above the pine-woods constituency.⁶⁶ In conversing with a Southern congressman representing a poor white district Hundley was informed that "in those Congressional districts in which they [the poor whites] mostly abound . . . no person who is temperate and lives cleanly, and like a gentleman, and who will not therefore condescend to drink and hurrah with every Tom, Dick, and Harry, need ever hope for politi-

⁶¹ J. F. H. Claiborne, *Mississippi as a Province, Territory, and State* (Jackson, Miss., 1880), I. 425.

⁶² *Ibid.*, p. 426.

⁶³ *Ibid.*

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 425, 427.

⁶⁵ Lyell, *Second Visit*, II. 70.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 70.

cal preferment. . . . He [the congressman] said, that, in certain parts of his district, 'the red-eye' was passed around in an old tin coffee-pot, and every man helped himself".⁶⁷ Hundley assures us that the color of the congressman's nose eloquently confirmed his remarks.

The prejudices and peculiarities of the poor white class were thus artfully made both to strengthen political machines and to bolster up the institution of slavery. This in itself presents no peculiar indictment of Southern society. The utilization of an illiterate electorate for personal political power was an outgrowth of the application of popular democracy typical of the country in general. Nor can one believe that the poor whites were being politically exploited. In their radical attachment to the institution of slavery they were expressing a groping class-consciousness based upon instinctive self-interest. To their undisciplined minds the possible emancipation of the despised negro presented social and economic dangers far greater than the continued superiority of the planter class. The individuality of the class was expressed by the barrier between themselves and the negro. Democracy made it possible for the poor whites to vote not as seemed wise to outsiders, but according to the complexes of their own psychology.

PAUL H. BUCK.

⁶⁷ Hundley, *Social Relations*, p. 269.

THE EUROPEAN POWERS AND THE FRENCH OCCUPATION OF TUNIS, 1878-1881, I.

I.

THE occupation of Tunis by France in 1881 was made possible by a most extraordinary conjunction of favorable circumstances fortunately taken advantage of by French statesmen. These remarkable circumstances have in part been known for a long time, and a whole array of scholars¹ have set themselves to explaining how England, contrary to all precedent, came to suggest and support the French enterprise. Little, comparatively, can be added to that side of the story, but the numerous documents and memoirs published since the end of the Great War have thrown a good deal of light on another aspect of the question, one barely noticed or suspected by most of the previous writers² and one which it now appears was by

¹ P. H. X. [d'Estournelles de Constant], *La Politique Française en Tunisie* (Paris, [1891]); Luigi Chiala, *Pagine di Storia Contemporanea*, II. *Tunisi* (second revised ed., Turin, 1895); Jean Darcy, *France et Angleterre* (Paris, 1904); Hans Plehn, "Die Methoden der Französischen Politik bei der Erwerbung Tunesiens", in *Zeitschrift für Politik*, VII. (1914) 1-48; Balthasar Hofstetter, *Die Vorgeschichte des Französischen Protektorats in Tunis bis zum Bardovertrag* (Bern, 1914); J. Lulvès, "Auf welche Weise machte sich Frankreich zum Herrn von Tunis?" in *Deutsche Revue*, XL. 125-142 (February, 1915); A. C. Coolidge, *The Origins of the Triple Alliance* (New York, 1919); Andrea Torre, "Come la Francia s'impadronì di Tunisi", in *Rivista di Roma*, April-May, 1899, reprinted in *La Concordia*, Jan. 2-6, 1915, and in Giacomo Curatulo, *Francia e Italia: Pagine di Storia, 1849-1914* (Turin, 1915), from which I quote in the sequel.

Plehn, in his excellent study, was led astray by ignorance of the facts. The present essay should show that while he may be right in praising the ability of the French statesmen, he entirely overdoes it and is certainly mistaken in saying that the general international situation was not particularly favorable (pp. 1-2). The article of J. Lulvès is good material for a study in the methods of German war propaganda. Together with an article by the same writer on the French acquisition of Nice (*Deutsche Revue*, December, 1914) and another on the history of Anglo-Italian relations (*ibid.*, March, 1915), it represents an attempt to poison the minds of the Italians against the English and the French. Though the articles are inadequately documented, it is evident that the writer has a good command of the source-material at that time available. The facts are of course presented in such a way as to prove his point. He rightly points out, however, that Bismarck's, or rather Bülow's, offers of Tunis to Italy have not been sufficiently considered, but he says nothing of Bismarck's support of the French and believes it unlikely (p. 141) that Bismarck did any such thing.

² Excepting Coolidge.

far the most important, that is, the policy of Bismarck in the Tunisian question.

It will not be necessary to recall more than a few of the more important dates of Tunisian history in order to understand the crisis which arose in the late 'seventies of the past century.³ After the conquest by the Turks in 1574 the country drifted into a sort of feudal anarchy under the rule of numerous local chieftains or of deys, and this situation continued until, in the early eighteenth century, one family, that of Hussein Bey, succeeded in establishing its preponderance over the others and founding a dynasty (the so-called Husseinite dynasty), which continued in power uninterruptedly up to and after the French occupation. Under the rule of this family, which remained nominally under the suzerainty of the Porte, Tunis became prominent as a piratical state and the name of its Bey came to be hated and feared by all Mediterranean countries as well as by some outside.

During all this period, and particularly after the conquest of Algiers, the French influence was easily the predominant one at the court of the Bey. English policy seems to have limited itself to keeping the French in check and to attempting to keep alive the fiction of Turkish sovereignty,⁴ even after the French had clearly shown their determination to prevent the realization of any Turkish hopes during the reoccupation of Tripoli in 1835. The Bey himself, who wanted none of the sultan's friendship, was only too glad to have the support of the French, and during the whole period from 1830 to the Crimean War the French consul held an undisputed position in Tunis.

The situation, so favorable to the French, took a decided turn for the worse during the Second Empire. Napoleon III. seems personally to have had but little appreciation for the possibilities of French expansion in North Africa, or else he desired to avoid conflict with the English and the Italians. In any case, French influ-

³ Coolidge (pp. 191-197) gives a masterly summary of the history of Tunis up to 1878. An excellent résumé, largely based on Constant, may be found also in Plehn (pp. 2-6). Other brief accounts are given in Hofstetter; Broadley, *The Last Punic War* (Edinburgh, 1882); Faucon, "La Tunisie"; and Salvemini in *Rivista d'Italia*, Feb. 15, 1925, pp. 78-81.

⁴ England maintained this claim till 1881, but see Hofstetter (p. 22) on the emptiness of it. Cf. also Hanotaux, *Histoire de la France Contemporaine*, IV. 653; Despagne, *La Diplomatie de la Troisième République et le Droit des Gens*, pp. 212 ff.; Engelhardt, "La Tunisie au Point de Vue International", in *Revue de Droit International et de Législation Comparée*, 1881, p. 331; and the exhaustive despatch of Barthélemy St. Hilaire to Tissot at Constantinople, Apr. 18, 1881, in *Livre Jaune*, supplement no. 234.

ence in Tunis was badly shaken. Napoleon first committed the unpardonable error of inducing the Bey to send a contingent to aid the sultan during the Crimean War, thereby indirectly recognizing the overlordship of the Porte.⁵ Later, in the 'sixties, when the European situation became strained, Tunis was neglected entirely. Indeed, it is said that Napoleon, in order to satisfy the ambitions of the ally he had deserted at Villafranca, encouraged Victor Emmanuel to take Tunis, and that the latter declined.⁶

Meanwhile the internal condition of Tunis rapidly degenerated. The Bey Ahmed, who ruled from 1837 to 1855, was a notorious spendthrift, who sapped the natural wealth of the country in order to build splendid palaces and elaborate barracks. From the time of his death the road led steadily downward. In 1859 the French obtained a monopoly of telegraph lines and the English, through the efforts of Sir Richard Wood, consul from 1855 to 1879, secured the concession for a railroad from Tunis to Goletta. In 1863 the first loan was floated in Paris. No Oriental state was ever able to save itself once these means were resorted to.

The next turning-point in the history of the Tunisian question was the defeat of France in 1870. As aforesaid, French influence had already declined, and, when a financial commission was instituted in 1869, England and Italy working together had succeeded in securing representation equal to that of France, though the latter held all the Tunisian national debt. The appearance on the scene of the Italians boded no good for the French, for the young kingdom quickly forgot the debt owed the sister Latin nation and began to cast longing eyes across the straits to the Carthage of old, to which many Italians had already emigrated and in which the Italian colony already outnumbered the rest of the foreign element.⁷ For a country desperately in need of more land, what could be more attractive than the fertile valleys of Tunis, located within a day's journey of Sicily, with which, in prehistoric times, it was probably connected? The Italians were only too ready to take advantage of the plight of their neighbor and gladly seized upon the slightest pretext to fit out

⁵ Hofstetter, pp. 26-27. The Bey, however, took the precaution of declaring that his obligations were merely of a religious nature.

⁶ Broadley, I. 161; d'Estournelles de Constant, p. 37; Chiala, II. 96-101. This refers to the situation in 1864. Evidently there was a difference between the official French attitude and the personal view of the emperor.

⁷ Chiala, pp. 95, 138-141. Cf. also Valbert, in *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 1881, pp. 207 ff.; Salvemini in *Rivista d'Italia*, Feb. 15, 1925, p. 80, note 2.

a squadron at Genoa in the autumn of 1870.⁸ But England had no desire to see both sides of the Straits in the hands of one nation, even a friendly one,⁹ and co-operated with the French in frustrating the Italian designs. On the other hand, England was on the alert for an opportunity to grind her own ax and induced the Bey to put himself under the protection of the Porte. The sultan proclaimed Tunis a Turkish province and invested the Bey as governor general. Fortunately for the French, they found the necessary time to follow events and to lodge a vigorous protest against this change in the international status of the country, which they refused to recognize.

During the early 'seventies the situation remained unchanged. The struggle for concessions continued, especially after the arrival of M. Roustan as French consul in 1874. But both France and Italy were too much occupied with domestic problems to devote their thoughts to schemes of annexation, and England was content to hold her own. In the meantime the Bey was fast approaching bankruptcy, for the dismissal of the unscrupulous Khaznadar, who had been minister since 1837, came too late to save the situation. It was not until the end of the Russo-Turkish War that the future of Tunis became a live issue.

It was at the Congress of Berlin that the fate of the Bey's dominions was decided upon, and, curiously enough, no less a person than Bismarck secured it for France. None but the most cogent reasons could have induced the German chancellor to take such an extraordinary step, and the explanation for his action can be found only in an examination of the general European situation at the time. We know that in December, 1873, Count Arnim, then German ambassador to Paris, vetoed French action in Tunis in no uncertain terms¹⁰ and that shortly after the German admiral in command of the German ships at Tunis made it very clear to the Bey that the interests of Germans must be kept on a par with those of other

⁸ Hofstetter, p. 48; d'Estournelles de Constant, pp. 60-66. Chiala, II. 104 ff., gives the Italian side of the story, which is not entirely convincing. Cf. further Rothan, *L'Allemagne et l'Italie, 1870-1871*, II. 100, 367, 375; Hanotaux, III. 642.

⁹ D'Estournelles de Constant, p. 60.

¹⁰ Hohenlohe, *Denkwürdigkeiten*, II. 199; Newton, *Life of Lord Lyons*, II. 60, who places the incident in January, 1874, and adds that the French foreign minister, the Duc Decazes, replied humbly that France had no intention of annexing Tunis. In this connection it is interesting to note that as early as 1868 Bismarck had hinted to the Italians that France must never be allowed to seize Tunis. Chiala, II. 101, quoting from the anonymous *Politica Segreta Italiana 1863-1870* (Turin, 1891).

foreigners.¹¹ Evidently there were at that time rumors of coming French aggression,¹² and Bismarck, already uneasy at the rapid recovery of the enemy, was determined to frustrate any early success on the part of the French government. Soon after, however, he changed his mind. It occurred to him that French activity in the Mediterranean and the Near East, where Germany was disinterested, would be an effective drain on French resources and would serve to divert the French from thoughts of revenge.¹³ He consequently took advantage of a remark made by the Duc Decazes during the celebrated war scare of 1875 to make his attitude perfectly clear.¹⁴

Of course the French could not be expected to act on the suggestion of the arch-intriguer. In any event his sincerity must be questioned and ulterior motives sought for.¹⁵ And, after all, the time was not ripe. Both in internal and in foreign affairs the situation of France was ill defined, and the opportunity for colonial enterprise was not a good one. Action in Tunis would almost certainly have met with the determined opposition of England and Italy.

Then came the crisis in the Eastern question and with it a total revolution in European international relations. Bismarck, anxious to keep aloof and to preserve peace in Central Europe, saw the situation change with kaleidoscopic rapidity. There were secret agreements between Russia and Austria, which called up the nightmare of a coalition *à la Kaunitz*. Then there were disputes between Austria and Russia, threats by the latter against the former, Russian appeals to Germany for support in a war against Austria, which Bismarck could not permit, and finally the total smash-up of the Three Emperors' League, that *rempart triangulaire* which Bismarck would fain have made the basis of his policy. To be sure, France and Italy played only very minor parts in these developments, but they interested European statesmen because both might at any time join the enemy.

Bismarck's primary aim was to preserve the peace among the great powers, and it was through his mediation that the Berlin Congress finally became possible. But peace was not secured by merely summoning a conference. The powers must be satisfied, if friction was to be removed permanently, and the only way in which this end

¹¹ Newton, *Lord Lyons*, II. 55.

¹² *Die Grosse Politik der Europäischen Kabinette, 1871-1914*, I. 303.

¹³ Bismarck to Hohenlohe, Jan. 10, 1875, *Die Grosse Politik*, I. 303; also Hohenlohe, *Denkwürdigkeiten*, II. 199.

¹⁴ Bismarck to Hohenlohe, Apr. 30, 1875, *Die Grosse Politik*, I. 262-264.

¹⁵ Coolidge, *op. cit.*, p. 203: "anything Bismarck approved of was feared as perhaps concealing a trap."

might be attained, in Bismarck's view, was to gratify their ambitions by territorial acquisitions to be carved from the possessions of the moribund Turkish Empire. His plan was simple enough: Russia was to have control of Bulgaria, Austria-Hungary of Bosnia and Herzegovina; England was to receive Egypt, while compensation was to be found for France and Italy in the Mediterranean. Albania, Tunis, Tripoli, and Syria would all serve the latter purpose. The difficulty lay in securing the approval of the powers to this scheme. Austria and England never agreed to giving Russia a free hand in Bulgaria, while Russia and Italy were equally opposed to the strengthening of Austria's position in the Balkans by the acquisition of the two Turkish provinces. France showed no inclination to abandon her claims to Egypt, while Italy kept a watchful eye on the procedure of the French in Tunis.

But Bismarck never despaired of his solution, and for years before the Congress of Berlin he did his utmost to obtain its acceptance. From November, 1875 on, he periodically suggested to the English statesmen that they occupy Egypt,¹⁶ and at the same time he joined Andrassy in proposing to the Italians that they take possession of Tunis.¹⁷ In reality Bismarck had no personal interest in the question of French and Italian claims to the latter territory.¹⁸ His point of view at this time is not hard to understand. He had no particular desire to bolster up the monarchical party in France by securing it a success in foreign policy, and at the same time he was anxious to remove the possibility of Italian opposition to the acquisition of Bosnia and Herzegovina by Austria, which had been agreed to by Russia. After the Left came into power in Italy, in 1876, there was always the danger lest the Irredentist movement should gain the upper hand in the peninsula, and there was further danger that the Italians would allow themselves to be drawn into an anti-Austrian policy by the Russians.¹⁹

¹⁶ Newton, *Lord Lyons*, II. 89; Gavard, *Un Diplomate à Londres*, p. 310; Cecil, *Life of Robert, Marquis of Salisbury*, II. 96-97, 102; *Die Grosse Politik*, II. 149-150, 153; Rumbold, *Further Recollections*, p. 103, etc. The timid Derby never countenanced these suggestions.

¹⁷ In August and again in October, 1876, Andrassy suggested to the Italian ambassador, Count Robilant, that the Italians occupy Tunis, but Robilant rejected these advances and was sustained by the Italian foreign office (Chiala, II. 107 ff.); cf. also the Capelli interview in the *Neue Freie Presse*, Aug. 3, 1906, according to which Bismarck made the same suggestions to Robilant through Andrassy in 1877. Cf. further Crispi, *Politica Estera*, pp. 65-66, for Andrassy's and Bismarck's approaches in 1877.

¹⁸ Coolidge, p. 201.

¹⁹ Ignatiev, in the course of his famous trip to the west, is reported to have offered Tunis to Italy in January, 1877. Chiala, II. 107 ff. On the revival of

Towards the end of 1877 and the beginning of 1878 the situation became very acute by reason of the victory of the Russians. The opposition to the victor crystallized more and more about England and Austria, and both looked around for allies. Bismarck maintained a benevolent neutrality, while Andrassy and Derby courted the Italians. From the French foreign minister, the Duc Decazes, who was a notorious proponent of a Franco-Russian alliance, neither the English nor the Austrians, least of all the Germans, hoped much. On the other hand, the Italian premier, Depretis, lent an ear to the suggestions coming from London and Vienna, even though the Irredentist agitation made it impossible for him to give up opposition to the aggrandizement of Austria in the Balkans.

The Cabinet changes which took place in France, England, and Italy in the last months of 1877 and the first months of 1878 caused a veritable revolution in the "constellation" of the powers. In Paris, after the republican victory of 1877, Gambetta, a cordial hater of the Russian autocracy, became the real political power. His first move was to overthrow Decazes and replace him with the Protestant Waddington, a man of English extraction and a firm advocate of a good understanding, not only with England, but also with Germany.²⁰ The obnoxious Gontaut-Biron was recalled from Berlin and replaced by the Comte de St. Vallier, whose views coincided with those of his chief and whose arrival in Berlin in January, 1878, may be said to mark the beginning of a new era in Franco-German relations.

The resignation of Derby and the appointment of Salisbury to the Foreign Office in March, 1878, was hardly of less significance, for, whatever may have been Salisbury's attitude towards Russia and Turkey when he represented England at the Constantinople conference in December, 1876, his policy had become perfectly defined by 1878. From March on England assumed the leadership of the coalition against Russia, and Bismarck found himself dealing with a man who firmly believed in the disruption of the Turkish Empire and who was willing to consider schemes of partition.²¹

Irredentism after 1876, see especially Gallavresi, *Italia e Austria, 1859-1914* (Milan, 1922), pp. 129-131. Salvemini, "Alla Vigilia del Congresso di Berlino", in *Nuova Rivista Storica*, IX. 72-93, January-February, 1925, has re-examined the whole problem of Italian-Austrian relations in this period and has corrected the data given by Crispi by adding hitherto unpublished material.

²⁰ He furthermore raised no objection whatsoever to the Austrian policy in the Balkans. Wimpffen to Andrassy, June 10, June 23, 1878, in the Vienna archives.

²¹ Cecil, *Life of Lord Salisbury*, II. 134-135.

Lastly there was the Cabinet change in Italy by which Depretis was swept away and succeeded by Benedetto Cairoli, an old Garibaldian with more than a tinge of Irredentism in his political faith. So far as the Tunisian question is concerned, this change was of the greatest possible significance, for it resulted in the complete isolation of Italy and the victory of France. In the time of Depretis Italy was wavering, but she was not ignored. Derby tried his best to effect a Mediterranean league in which Italy was to play a prominent rôle.²² Andrassy was all too anxious to gain the consent of the Italians to the annexation, or at least occupation, of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and he did not hesitate to renew his offers of Tunis as compensation.²³ As for the Russians, they too had done their utmost to secure the support of Italy. Count Nigra, the Italian ambassador in St. Petersburg, was a firm supporter of the idea of a Russo-Italian entente, and Count Tornielli, the under-secretary in the Consulta, was an able henchman.²⁴ But Depretis had proved an insuperable obstacle. Firmly believing that the treaty of San Stefano was detrimental to Italian interests in the Balkans, he was ready to go hand in hand with England and Austria,²⁵ and, if he had not accepted the suggestions of Andrassy in regard to Tunis, the sole reason was the fear of complications with France, with which power the Italians were negotiating a commercial treaty.

²² Menabrea to Depretis, Mar. 16, 1878, *Italian Green Book*, quoted by G. Amadori-Vergili, *La Politica Estera Italiana*, pp. 122-123. Crispi, *op. cit.*, pp. 73-74. On Mar. 9, 1878, Menabrea telegraphed that he had begun to confer with Derby on the state of affairs in Egypt, Tripoli, and Tunis. According to Giolitti (*Memorie*, I. 131) Derby actually offered Italy Tunis in return for co-operation in a Mediterranean league.

²³ Cf. the following, from the Vienna archives, Andrassy to Haymerle Feb. 26, 1878: "Wir sind gerne bereit einen Wunsch Italiens nach einer Kompensation, sei es einer Insel, eines Hafens, Tunis oder Tripoli in Freundschaft zu prüfen und sogar gegebenen Falles bei den Kabinetten zu unterstützen." Later Andrassy again suggested Tunis to Robilant (Haymerle to Andrassy, Mar. 8, 1878). Haymerle to Andrassy, Mar. 2, 1878, suggests that Italy be offered compensation in the Mediterranean. "Allerdings", he remarks, "wird die vorsichtige italienische Politik vielleicht bei Tunis den Anstand erheben, dass hierdurch ein steter Antagonismus mit den Interessen des wieder erstarkenden Frankreich geschaffen werde. Tripolis hätte diese Gefahr nicht, aber auch weniger Reiz. Bei einer grösseren Insel, z. B. Cypern [!] käme man in das Gebiet des Hellenismus, ein kleiner Gegensatz mit diesem würde jedoch unseren Interessen nicht abträglich sein."

²⁴ The documents in the Vienna archives show that Andrassy was kept informed of Nigra's intrigues through a secret agent.

²⁵ Haymerle to Andrassy, Feb. 2, 1878, reports Depretis as saying that Italy and Austria must reach an understanding and that Russia must not be allowed to have the Dardanelles. Similarly, Haymerle to Andrassy, Mar. 12, Mar. 17, 1878, in Vienna archives.

Now all was changed. Cairoli, who had lost four brothers in the wars against the Austrians and who had married a lady from Trent, was filled with deep hatred for the Danube monarchy, and, even if he did not support the Irredentists during his term of office, he certainly did little to check the agitation, which assumed unheard of dimensions after March, 1878.²⁶ As for Count Corti, the new foreign minister in the Cairoli Cabinet—a homely but charming person—his position was difficult in the extreme. As a representative of the old aristocracy he was hardly fit to sit in a Cabinet of the Left. Above all, his views on foreign policy were the very antithesis of those held by Cairoli and his friends. Corti was convinced that Italy was not strong enough to pursue a policy of adventure. With her unity essentially effected he believed that Italy's most immediate duty was to consolidate her position and to maintain friendly relations, especially with Austria. Why Cairoli should have desired his presence in the Cabinet it is difficult to say. Possibly he was meant to conciliate Austria officially while the anti-Austrian agitation went on.

Corti had entered the ministry only on the express condition that his policy of friendliness with Austria should be pursued,²⁷ and from the beginning he acted on the principle of "clean hands". The advances of the English were rejected,²⁸ and renewed efforts on the part of Andrassy to soothe the Italians by promises of compensation were rejected as *non-avenue*. Corti did not believe in the principle of compensation and felt that the acceptance of the Austrian offers would either lead to complications with other powers or at best would require military expeditions for which the country was not ready.²⁹

²⁶ On Irredentism see *La Politica Estera Italiana*, pp. 165 ff., 174 ff.; also Mayr, *Der Italienische Irredentismus*, pp. 278–290; Crispi, pp. 3–4; Chiala, vol. II., ch. V.; Reggio, *Storia della Grande Guerra d'Italia*, I. *Le Origini Remote*, pp. 154 ff.; Salvemini, in *Rivista d'Italia*, Feb. 15, 1925, pp. 60–66.

²⁷ Andrassy to Haymerle, Mar. 27, 1878; Haymerle to Andrassy, Apr. 1, 1878, in Vienna archives. The story is told in detail in a manuscript article sent me by Count Egon Corti and based on the private Corti papers. A translation of this article has recently been published by Count Corti under the title, "Il Conte Corti al Congresso di Berlino", in *Nuova Antologia*, Apr. 16, 1925.

²⁸ Depretis had expressed his willingness to support any acceptable English project in regard to the Dardanelles. Haymerle to Andrassy, Feb. 11, 1878. See also Gwynn and Tuckwell, *Life of Sir Charles Dilke*, I. 248–249.

²⁹ Haymerle to Andrassy, Apr. 1, 1878, reports having suggested compensation to Corti, who asked what form the compensation should take. "Tunis, Tripolis, u. s. w.", said Corti, "sien unpopulär wegen möglicher Complicationen und Ausgaben; er sei im Principe überhaupt gegen Compensationstheorie; von Italien und Deutschland habe man auch nichts verlangt, als sie sich vergrößerten" [*sic*!]. Haymerle to Andrassy, May 11, 1878, reports making a new

Besides that, he knew that what his colleagues really wanted was the Trentino and Trieste.³⁰ The conflict of views within the Cabinet could at best be temporarily patched up, and it was clearly brought out in the Cabinet meeting of June 6, 1878, when the instructions for Corti's attitude at the coming congress of Berlin were decided on. After a hot debate, and as a result of Corti's threat to resign, it was finally agreed that Italy should not oppose the occupation of Bosnia and Herzegovina by Austria-Hungary, but should do its utmost to circumscribe the terms of the occupation as closely as possible and insist that the sovereignty of the Porte be maintained. On the other hand, it was decided that if Austria should annex the two provinces outright, then the Italian representatives should examine the terrain as to the possibilities of demanding compensation.³¹

All these developments did not escape the attention of the German chancellor. He perhaps did not sympathize with Andrassy's anxiety to obtain Bosnia and Herzegovina,³² but he was determined to support him if necessary and to defend Austria from the Irredentist agitation.³³ The Cairoli Cabinet was not such as to inspire him with confidence,³⁴ though Corti and his views met with his entire sym-

advance to Corti, who replied: "Oh, ce serait une diplomatie cousue de fil blanc, qui a peut-être pu tenter Depretis et consorts, mais à laquelle moi je ne me prêterais pas." In regard to Albania Corti said: "Il vaudrait encore mieux la donner à la Grèce qu'à l'Italie." Benedetti (*Revue des Deux Mondes*, Feb. 15, 1891, p. 889, note) already made the statement that Haymerle had offered Tunis to Cairoli.

³⁰ Haymerle to Andrassy, Mar. 2, 1878. Cf. also Minghetti in the Chamber, Mar. 17, 1880: "La questione dell'Italia irredenta non è altro che uno strascico della cattiva politica italiana rispetto alla Bosnia ed all'Erzegovina. . . . Pareva che un compenso materiale fosse dovuto all'Italia dall'annessione di altri territori all'Impero austro-ungarico." Chiala, II. 60-61.

³¹ Gravenegg to Andrassy, June 10, 1878; Grabinski, *Depretis*, pp. 255-256, who gives the story as told him by a friend of Corti. Here again I have drawn extensively on Count Egon Corti's manuscript, especially for the instructions finally given.

³² In a memorandum Corti told of an interesting remark made by Bismarck at a buffet supper during the congress. Turning to the Italian foreign minister he said: "Sehen Sie diese gebratene Taube dort; ich denke dabei an Oesterreich; dieses rührt sich nicht, und wartet, dass die Taube ihm in den Mund fliegt. Und das genügt ihm nicht einmal; es will sich den Mund durch Europa gewaltsam öffnen lassen, damit die gebratene Taube hineinfliegen kann" (from Corti manuscript article).

³³ Haymerle to Andrassy, Apr. 17, 1878, reports that Keudell, the German ambassador in Rome, had warned Cairoli to let alone the question of Bosnia and Herzegovina if he valued German friendship. Similarly Gravenegg to Andrassy, June 11, 1878, in Vienna archives.

³⁴ He also suspected that Cairoli would effect a Russo-Italian understanding. Károlyi to Andrassy, Apr. 6, 1878, writes that an agent of the embassy had re-

pathy.³⁵ On the other hand, Disraeli and Salisbury were men to whom he could speak his own language, and the changes in France for the time being put an end to all prospects of a Franco-Russian alliance.³⁶ St. Vallier was overwhelmed with attentions when he came to Berlin, and there was more than an academic discussion of the possibility of a visit of Gambetta to Bismarck.³⁷ Quick to adapt himself to the demands of the situation, the German chancellor, great opportunist that he was, reorganized his system. Andrassy might still attempt to buy off opposition to the Austrian Balkan policy by offering compensation, but Bismarck executed a *volte-face*.

It was Bismarck who mediated between Russia and England, and there can, I think, be no doubt that he was initiated into the English plans regarding Turkey. Realizing that any increase of English power in the Mediterranean world would arouse the susceptibilities of France, he determined that suitable compensation should be offered her.³⁸ Already in February, 1878, he told the Prince of Wales in Berlin that England should take Egypt. To the prince's remark that France might object to this solution, the German chancellor replied that he would find means to prevent France's quarrelling with England.³⁹ We have a letter from Count Münster dated April 20, 1878, in which the writer says: "What France is striving for in Africa, and what is regarded as necessary for the consolidation of her power in Algeria, is Tunis, the old Carthage and the wonderful harbor of Cape Bon. For England this French acquisition would be far less serious than for Italy."⁴⁰ Münster was prob-

ported that the Russo-Italian agreement was as good as complete and that Italy would declare war on Austria as soon as the latter joined England. Italy would occupy the Trentino and Trieste. Bismarck even suspected Depretis of gambling for a break between Austria and Russia, in order to join the latter, and he warned the Italians about opposing Austrian plans in the Balkans. Károlyi to Andrassy, Feb. 23, 1878; Haymerle to Andrassy, Apr. 27, 1878, in Vienna archives.

³⁵ Cf. Lucius von Ballhausen, *Bismarck-Erinnerungen*, p. 141.

³⁶ Wimpffen to Andrassy, Mar. 29, 1878, in Vienna archives.

³⁷ On St. Vallier's reception see Bourgeois and Pagès, *Les Responsabilités de la Guerre*, pp. 181-183; Daudet, *La Mission du Comte St. Vallier*, pp. 37-39. Waddington was much pleased by the assurances given to St. Vallier by Bismarck, Wimpffen to Andrassy, Feb. 20, 1878, Vienna archives. On the projected visit of Gambetta see, among others, Deschanel, *Gambetta*, pp. 246 ff.; Münz, *Von Bismarck bis Bülow*, p. 132; Galli, *Gambetta et l'Alsace-Lorraine*; Bismarck, *Gedanken und Erinnerungen*, Anhang II., pp. 493 ff.

³⁸ Károlyi to Andrassy, Mar. 2, 1878, reports that Bismarck expected England to take some territory if Austria took Bosnia and Herzegovina. He adds that Bismarck had no objection to such a solution.

³⁹ Lee, *Edward VII.*, I. 432.

⁴⁰ Münster to Bismarck, Apr. 20, 1878, *Die Grosse Politik*, II. 291.

ably speaking the thought of his chief, who now returned to his earlier idea of giving the French a free hand in Tunis. There was reason to suppose that Salisbury would lend a willing ear, and, indeed, when the suggestion was made to him, early in May, he appears to have raised no objection. The ground had already been well prepared by Lord Lyons, the English ambassador in Paris, who repeatedly sent letters reflecting his apprehensions as to the possible reaction in France in case England took Cyprus or some other point in the eastern Mediterranean.⁴¹ The evidence indicates that the Cyprus-Tunis arrangement (and the two questions can not be separated at this time) was made between England and Germany before the congress opened. At any rate it was settled before the congress was well under way.⁴² It may be that Andrassy was in the secret. At any rate it is interesting that the discussions begun in late April followed almost immediately upon the last offer made by Andrassy to Italy.⁴³

On July 7, the day before the Cyprus Convention was divulged by the *Daily Telegraph*, Salisbury sought out Waddington and communicated its contents to him.⁴⁴ The French minister was of course very much upset,⁴⁵ and Salisbury would no doubt have found himself in a bad fix had he not been able to make an immediate offer of compensation, namely, a promise of English good-will in case France decided to take action in Tunis.⁴⁶ Waddington, to be sure, had his doubts, but, even though the French Cabinet absolutely forbade his bringing the matter before the congress for approval, he listened attentively to the assurances of Salisbury and Beaconsfield and took

⁴¹ Newton, *Lord Lyons*, II. 139; Cecil, *Lord Salisbury*, II. 270, 276-277, 280.

⁴² Blowitz in *London Times*, Apr. 5, 1881, reprinted with some changes in his *Memoirs*, pp. 140 ff.

⁴³ Andrassy to Haymerle, Apr. 5, 1878, instructs him not to make any further suggestions to the Italians in regard to compensation.

⁴⁴ Hanotaux, IV. 385; Cecil, *Life of Lord Salisbury*, II. 294-295. According to Newton (*Lord Lyons*, II. 148-150) Salisbury first wrote to Waddington on the sixth. The letter is reproduced in part. Busch, in *Deutsche Rundschau*, CXLI. (1909) 375, records rumors of the English intentions as early as June 28.

⁴⁵ After the congress he told the Austrian ambassador that he had expected England to take Mytilene, though the Cyprus Convention was a total surprise. Wimpffen to Andrassy, July 20, 1878.

⁴⁶ Cecil, *Lord Salisbury*, II. 270, 332; Hanotaux, IV. 386-387; Constant, pp. 78-79. Beaconsfield confirmed what Salisbury had said. Hanotaux, quoting the unpublished memoirs of Baron de Courcel, is authority for the statement that Salisbury told Waddington: "Vous ne pouvez pas laisser Carthage aux mains des barbares." Darcy, p. 203, gives the same substance in the form of a question: "Jusqu'à quand laisserez-vous Carthage entre les mains des barbares?"

the encouragement of Bismarck for what it was worth.⁴⁷ There can be no doubt that he personally became gradually fascinated with the idea and intended to realize on the promises given as soon as the opportunity should arise. It was with considerable pride that, on leaving the congress, he exclaimed to a friend, as he slapped his hand on his pocket: "In here I am bringing back Tunis."⁴⁸

While both England and Germany were anxious to keep the French "grouped" in order to prevent their defection to the Russian side, neither the one nor the other seems to have cared much what became of the Italian hopes. Salisbury was so negligent of the feelings of the Italian foreign minister that the latter was not informed of the Cyprus Convention as were the other delegates. Corti was left to learn of it from the newspapers on July 8,⁴⁹ and, when the second Italian plenipotentiary, Count de Launay, discussed the matter with Salisbury a few days later, he was put off with vague references concerning the possibilities of compensation for Italy in the Mediterranean.⁵⁰ The Germans assumed the same

⁴⁷ Hanotaux, IV. 388-389; Mme. Waddington, *My First Years as a Frenchwoman*, p. 150. For Bismarck's encouraging remarks to Waddington and St. Vallier, see Daudet, pp. 86 ff., 171, 172. Dilke, *Europe in 1887*, p. 275; Newton, *Lord Lyons*, II. 244. So far as I know, the first to divulge Bismarck's part was Mme. Adam, the friend of Gambetta, in the *Nouvelle Revue*, Aug. 1, 1880, and Mar. 15, 1889. The statement of Count Hesse-Wartegg in the *Century Magazine*, April, 1882, is also of source value. Broadley (I. 93), whose book was published in 1882, says that Bismarck asked Waddington: "Why do you not go to Carthage?" The source is not given. The flat denials of Ferry (*Estafette*, Oct. 22, 1889) and of Charmes (*Journal des Débats*, Oct. 29, 1889) prove nothing. After the Boulanger crisis no one wished to acknowledge having had friendly relations with Bismarck.

⁴⁸ Darcy (p. 204) and after him many others. A remark made by Waddington's secretary, Herbet, some years later is worth quoting. After recalling that Bismarck had made the offer to the French he says he advised his chief, if he were to take Tunis at all, to take it immediately with a Berlin date. Holstein memorandum, July 18, 1890, in *Die Grosse Politik*, VIII. 29.

⁴⁹ Salisbury, to be sure, claims that he had just made out a copy of the convention for Corti when the secret leaked out in the newspaper. Cecil, *Lord Salisbury*, II. 295.

⁵⁰ Salisbury seems to have said something about the Mediterranean littoral being large enough to satisfy both France and Italy. De Launay inferred from this that he was hinting at Tripoli or even Tunis. See his letter of Aug. 11, 1878, in Crispien, p. 94, referred to also by Chiala (II. 116-117). The events were even more obscured when in May, 1881, the London *Standard* published a document according to which Salisbury and Waddington and Corti had agreed at Berlin that if France annexed Tunis Italy should receive Tripoli. This was immediately denied by Corti, but the Italian ambassador in London was instructed to make inquiries at the Foreign Office and was told by Dilke that there were documents in London bearing on such a conversation. Dilke, *Europe in 1887*,

attitude of indifference. On the very day of the publication of the convention, Count Corti hurried to Bülow, the second German delegate, to ask for explanations. It was on this occasion that the German diplomat made the remark that Italy might take Tunis. It is not true that Bismarck gave the same advice, though it does seem unlikely that Bülow made the suggestion entirely on his own responsibility.⁵¹

p. 3; Gwynn and Tuckwell, *Life of Sir Charles Dilke*, I. 334; Crispi, pp. 91-94. This cryptic utterance simply helped to perpetuate the legend. Count Egon Corti has sent me from his uncle's archives two documents which clear up the matter. In a letter to King Humbert of Aug. 15, 1878, the Italian minister wrote: "Cte Launay avuto colloqui con Ld. Salisbury e Lord Odo Russel i quali consigliano pure di stare all'erta di quelle parti." The second document is a memorandum dated June 12, 1883, referring to a talk with Lord Salisbury, though it does not appear who the interlocutor was. The following statement is significant: "Lord Salisbury mi dichiarò nei termini i più positivi rammentarsi che nel Congresso di Berlino non segui alcuno negoziato nè alcuni colloqui fra di esse ed i plenipotenziari dei stati e di Francia che implicasse la cessione di Tunisi alla Francia e di Tripoli all'Italia." While the statement may have been technically true, it must be admitted that it represents rather sharp practice in the use of words. From later references made by Lord Salisbury it appears that not only Tunis, but Tripoli, was actually discussed by him and Waddington, but that it was the latter who advocated assigning Tripoli to Italy, while Salisbury was unwilling to tie his hands. Hatzfeldt to Caprivi, June 2, 1890, and Aug. 1, 1890, *Die Grosse Politik*, VIII. 240, 262. It is interesting to note that Chiala, who made much of the reputed English offer in his first edition, practically passes over the matter in the second edition.

⁵¹ What was actually said to Count Corti at Berlin has been one of the most disputed points in the whole story. The kernel of truth was magnified with each telling. The first mention of the incident was by Broadley (I. 169). It was reprinted in many papers in 1882 and was not denied by Corti. In the *Nouvelle Revue* for Mar. 15, 1889, Mme. Adam said that she had been told about it both by Corti and by Gambetta in 1878. See also Dilke, *Europe in 1887* (pp. 3, 27), for the testimony of Capponi, who says he had it from Corti, and the statement of Beccarini, who said that there were "irrefragable documents" to prove it (Chiala, II. 112, note). References of a similar nature may be found in Billot, *La France et l'Italie*, II. 53, and Fitzmaurice, *Life of Lord Granville*, II. 234. Valbert, in the *Figaro* for Jan. 24, 1891 (quoted by Chiala), says that Corti told him in Constantinople in 1881 that Bismarck had told him several times to take the morsel if he wished, and Corti himself told Dilke on one occasion: "One more powerful than Lord Salisbury, more powerful than Lord Beaconsfield, advised me to take Tunis" (Gwynn and Tuckwell, *Sir Charles Dilke*, I. 334). Cf. further Cappelli in the *Neue Freie Presse* for Aug. 3, 1906, who says that Bülow went to Corti and told him that Bismarck would be glad to bring the question of an Italian occupation of Tunis before the congress. As in the case of Tripoli the Italians were evidently rather free in their version of the affair. Count Egon Corti has sent me the following letter written by his uncle to King Humbert on Aug. 15, 1878, which finally settles the question: "Sempre silenzio sull'affare di Tunisi dall'Ambasciata a Parigi. Nè maggiori ragguagli si ricevono da Tunisi. Sa Maestà Vostra si rammenta come il Sgr. Bülow mi dicesse a Berlino, evidente-

Corti is reported to have replied to Bülow's remark: "Vous voulez donc nous brouiller avec la France?"⁵² This was in keeping with the stand he had taken when similar suggestions had been made by Andrassy before the congress, and it seems obvious that he could not justly be blamed for having allowed Tunis to slip through his fingers. Italian writers, who have almost uniformly accused him of neglecting the interests of his country, should remember one or two points in connection with his action. In the first place, the Italians had had no reason to suspect the Cyprus Convention, and so far as I know there is no evidence that they did suspect it. Consequently there could have been no thought of asking for compensation. Furthermore Corti was well known as an opponent of the compensation theory, and both he and Cairoli were, before 1878 at least, adherents of the policy of friendship with France.⁵³ But above all, it should be remembered that the desire for compensation on the part of Cairoli and his consorts had nothing whatsoever to do with the Mediterranean. Depretis had rejected suggestions that Italy seek acquisitions in the Mediterranean, and evidently Corti had the support of his chief when he turned a deaf ear to the proposals of Andrassy. It should be recalled that in 1877 even Crispi had ignored intimations regarding Albania. It is impossible to overemphasize the fact that Cairoli and his friends desired a *quid pro quo* for the Austrian occupation of Bosnia and Herzegovina and that that compensation was not to be in the Mediterranean, but in the Trentino and Trieste.⁵⁴ It was only after Corti's repeated refusal to consider any such demands and only after the news of the

mente da parte del Pr. Bismarck: 'Pourquoi ne prendriez-vous pas Tunis?'" Obviously the complicity of Bismarck has never rested on more than conjecture. Nevertheless I note in a recent book by Theodor Wolff (*Das Vorspiel*, 1925, p. 291) that Prince Bülow in a letter of July 28, 1916, to the author, repeats the statement which had become traditional in diplomatic circles: "Auf dem Berliner Kongress bot Bismarck den Italienern Tunis an."

⁵² Chiala (II. 111) and many others. What the source for the statement was I have no idea. It was probably more or less of a legend.

⁵³ Crispi, p. 79; Chiala, II. 111-112.

⁵⁴ All this comes out clearly from the manuscript copy of Count Egon Corti's article on his uncle's policy at the congress. It appears that Andrassy had restricted his demand in regard to Bosnia and Herzegovina to mere occupation, instead of asking for annexation, solely in order to satisfy the Italians. Corti had confined himself to merely making reservations on this point, as it had been agreed upon in his instructions. But Cairoli wrote in considerable excitement, again intimating that Italy should be compensated, evidently in the Trentino and Trieste. Corti, however, stood firm by his original view, and no one will dispute his argument that there was nothing to gain and everything to lose by raising the point.

Cyprus Convention that Cairoli became suspicious of possible developments in the Mediterranean and began to entertain the idea of obtaining satisfaction elsewhere.⁵⁵

Something, it seems to me, can also be said in defense of the policy pursued by Salisbury and Bismarck. As for the former, no objection can be raised to his statements technically. He gave the French a free hand in Tunis and merely indicated that the Italians might look about the Mediterranean for a set-off. There was of course something questionable in this, in so far as Salisbury, as well as the other diplomats at Berlin, knew perfectly well that what Italy wanted in the Mediterranean was Tunis, not Tripoli, nor Albania, nor an island. But the fact that Salisbury thought it necessary to appease only the French and merely ignored the Italians is only one more bit of evidence that Italy was at the time held in so low esteem that no consideration was given her whatsoever.

This was true of Bismarck perhaps even more than of Salisbury. The Italians were to him distinctly an unstable element, pro-Russian, anti-Austrian, land-hungry, and inclined to jeopardize the prospects of peace by raising objections to the arrangements which, to be sure, were being made without consulting them.⁵⁶ It has been said that he intended to lay the foundations for a long estrangement between Italy and France by encouraging the French to take Tunis. But this point must not be pressed too far. He had no way of knowing that the French would actually take his advice. They had ignored it entirely in 1875. As for his Mephistophelean action in offering the same thing to two parties it should be borne in mind that, after all, there is no proof that Bülow had been instructed to broach the matter to Corti. It is well known that there was a great deal of talk about compensation for this, that, and the other person at Berlin.⁵⁷ Not only Egypt and Tunis, but Albania, Syria, Rhodes,

⁵⁵ I shall return to this point later.

⁵⁶ Cf. Grabinski, *Depretis*, p. 268. Bismarck is reputed to have referred to the Italians as an unstable factor, neither friend nor foe, when Corti's reply to Bülow was reported to him. Chiala, II. 111. The Austrian ambassador in Paris was told by Waddington after the congress that Bismarck had spoken of the necessity of watching the insatiable land-hunger of the Italians more carefully than ever. Wimpffen to Andrassy, July 20, 1878, in Vienna archives.

⁵⁷ Cf. Dilke, *Europe in 1887*, p. 27: "The labors of the Berlin Congress, or its festivities, so confused the minds of the plenipotentiaries that they have never been clear who offered what to whom; but it at least seems plain, unless we are to believe that the diplomats of the day exceeded Talleyrand himself in their powers of imagination, that a great deal of offering of other people's property took place." Corti himself made a similar remark to Dilke: "At that time everybody was telling everybody else to take something which belonged to somebody else" (Gwynn and Tuckwell, *Sir Charles Dilke*, I. 334).

and Tripoli were mentioned in various connections. Though it seems unlikely, it is nevertheless possible that Bülow may not have been *au courant* of the latest developments. It may even be conceived that in the course of the conversation he said Tunis instead of Tripoli.⁵⁸ And in any case he could not know that the Italians, who had repeatedly rejected the idea, would now, when the prospects for the Trentino were entirely vanishing, take the matter seriously.

It might be argued further that Tunis had been suggested by Salisbury to Waddington on July 7 and that it was by no means certain that the intimation would have any consequences. When Bismarck broached the subject to Waddington and St. Vallier is not known, but it is practically certain that it was not done before July 8. We know that he had a talk with Waddington on the thirteenth,⁵⁹ and it was undoubtedly on that occasion that the question was raised. If this is so, then Bismarck was abandoning it to France only after the Italians had rejected it. But this too is merely a technicality, for it is almost certain that Bismarck had arranged with the English some time before and that Salisbury's offer to Waddington was made with the German chancellor's approval. When all is said and done, one comes away with the distinct impression that Bismarck, like Salisbury, did not hold the Italians worthy of any consideration.⁶⁰

II.

Count Corti returned from Berlin with clean hands, as he had intended, but in Italy the clean hands appeared to many rather like empty hands.⁶¹ The indignation in Italy when the Austrian occupa-

⁵⁸ Of course I would not press this point. But I do want to call attention to Chiala's statement (p. 111) that Bülow's suggestion to Corti "aveva un carattere di serietà ben più spiccato di quando era stata ripetutamente rivolta dal Conte Andrassy e dal Generale Ignatieff al Conte di Robilant". Exactly the opposite seems to have been true. Count Egon Corti in his manuscript refers to the suggestion as "eine flüchtige Erwähnung", which is probably nearer the truth. It is interesting to note that in November, 1880, Bismarck told St. Vallier that in the summer of 1879 he had warned the Italians to abandon Tunis and divert their energies to Tripoli. Bourgeois and Pagès, p. 203, note 2.

⁵⁹ Kohl, *Bismarckregesten*, II. 164.

⁶⁰ Cf. Grabinski, *Depretis*, p. 271: "Il est certain que, sans l'hostilité de l'Italie officielle contre l'Autriche . . . M. de Bismarck n'aurait pas encouragé la conquête de Tunis par la France." Cf. also Crispi's remark concerning the position of the Italians at the congress: "uniliati como l'ultimo popolo d'Europa ne tornammo colle beffe e collo scorno" (quoted by Coolidge, p. 190, note). Similarly the remark of Andrea Torre (in Curatulo, *Francia e Italia, 1849-1914*, p. 94): "L'Italia pareva un enigma, laddove in realtà era men che quello, era il nulla."

⁶¹ Coolidge, p. 190.

tion of Bosnia and Herzegovina became known went beyond all bounds and may be compared with the excitement in Russia. Corti was almost stoned in the streets of Milan and had a difficult time defending his policy against the attacks of the Crispi group, which had started a veritable campaign against him in the press. Both the German and the Austrian ambassadors intervened in his behalf, but this served only to discredit the foreign minister even more. In October Corti resigned, unwilling to associate himself with the new outburst of Irredentism that was countenanced by the Cairoli ministry.⁶²

In France, however, the dissatisfaction felt on account of the Cyprus Convention soon blew over, and Waddington began to busy himself with plans looking to the realization of the promises given him at Berlin.⁶³ Indeed, it is said that before the year was out he had worked out the draft of a treaty to be imposed on the Bey.⁶⁴ However this may be, he lost no time in getting some tangible confirmation of Salisbury's utterances. On July 16, the very day of his return to Paris, he sought out Lord Lyons, the English ambassador, and recounted to him the conversations he had had with Salisbury.⁶⁵ The report of this interview left for London on the same day, and great was the consternation of the English foreign minister when he learned that the businesslike Waddington meant to pin him down to his promises.⁶⁶ He did what he could to tone down the effect of the Berlin conversations, but the French foreign minister insisted, and in the end Salisbury could no longer evade the responsibility and confined himself to indicating the possibility of difficulties likely

⁶² Grabinski, p. 257; also Andrassy to Gravenegg, July 15, 1878, and Gravenegg to Andrassy, July 15, 1878, Vienna archives. The whole story is entered into with considerable detail by Count Egon Corti (manuscript), who also quotes from the letter submitted by the German ambassador in defense of Corti.

⁶³ Cf. Cialdini's report of July 14, 1878, in Chiala, II. 118-120. Wimpffen to Andrassy, July 20, 1878 (Vienna archives), reports Waddington as saying that he had had a long talk with Gambetta and had appeased the latter's wrath against the English. It appears that the Prince of Wales also devoted his best efforts to appeasing the great tribune. Lee, *Edward VII.*, I. 366-368.

⁶⁴ Constant, p. 172, note. St. Hilaire's interview with a representative of the *Daily News* in 1881, quoted by Hippeau, *Histoire Diplomatique de la Troisième République*, p. 394. Duc de Broglie in *Le Français*, Nov. 9, 1881, says the draft was actually submitted to the Bey, who, however, refused even to read it.

⁶⁵ Gwynn and Tuckwell, *Sir Charles Dilke*, I. 382.

⁶⁶ Lyons had written announcing the coming despatch of Waddington. Salisbury was extremely anxious that Waddington's request for written assurances should not be too peremptory. See Newton, *Lord Lyons*, II. 154-156; Cecil, *Lord Salisbury*, II. 333.

to arise in Italy.⁶⁷ Discussions continued throughout the autumn and winter, and in London it was confidently expected that France would take action in the near future.⁶⁸

In reality, however, Waddington had only taken the first step when he secured the written approval of the English government. Opposition to his scheme was greater in Paris even than in London. Whatever may have been the attitude of MacMahon,⁶⁹ the decisive fact was that Gambetta, the man whose influence outweighed that of all others, was firmly opposed. He was not ready to give up his idea of revenge, and, with that marvellous sensitiveness for public opinion, he felt that the country was not yet prepared for new ventures abroad. Nor was he alone in fearing the Greeks bearing gifts and in his suspicions that Bismarck's ultimate motive was to dissipate the power of France, preparatory perhaps to a preventive war.⁷⁰ Then, too, there was the question as to the attitude of the Italians, which had occurred to Waddington at Berlin,⁷¹ and which Salisbury, inconsiderate though he himself had been towards the Italians, now re-emphasized.

⁶⁷ Salisbury admitted that the general tenor of Waddington's despatches was correct, but objected that the French minister's "vivacious French" by no means rendered the tone of the communication made at Berlin. Waddington's despatch has never been published, but Salisbury's reply is in Newton, *Lord Lyons*, II. 158-159. Waddington thereupon redrafted his despatch and stated that from then on France would permit no other power to establish itself in Tunis. *State Papers*, LXXIII. 437. Salisbury's guarded reply of Aug. 7 is in the *State Papers*, *ibid.*, p. 440.

⁶⁸ Newton, *Lord Lyons*, II. 163. Salisbury and Waddington had a conference, chiefly on the Egyptian question, at Dieppe on Sept. 2, 1878 (Monypenny and Buckle, *Disraeli*, VI. 371), and on Sept. 5 in Paris (Cecil, *Salisbury*, II. 312, 334). Salisbury later told an Italian diplomat that he remembered "che il Signor Waddington la intratene un giorno in ferrovia o in vapore dell' eventualità dell'occupazione della Tunisi da parte della Francia nella quale occasione il Ministro degli affari esteri di Francia gli additava Tripoli come compenso a darsi all'Italia. E sembrava a S. E. che essendosi essa trasferita a Parigi nel Settembre dello stesso anno il Sr. Waddington gli facene di nuovo menzione della cessione di Tripoli all'Italia". Memorandum dated June 12, 1883, from Corti archives.

⁶⁹ On MacMahon's attitude see the two conflicting source-accounts in Hanotaux, IV. 388-389. Broadley (I. 142) says that in 1865-1866 Marshal Randon and MacMahon had urged Napoleon III. to assert France's rights in Tunis. Constant (p. 172, note) says MacMahon was in favor of action, though Gambetta was opposed.

⁷⁰ Constant, p. 81; Hanotaux, IV. 640; Cialdini's reports of July 18 and Aug. 19, 1878, in Chiala, II. 123, 134-135; Deschanel, *Gambetta*, p. 292.

⁷¹ So Waddington told Lyons on his return from Berlin (Gwynn and Tuckwell, I. 382). Cf. also the references made by Salisbury to Hatzfeldt, *Die Grosse Politik*, VIII. 240, 262.

There was every reason to fear the opposition of the Italians, for since the congress feeling in that country had been running high. Hopes of acquiring the Trentino and Trieste had, to be sure, been reduced to the vanishing point, but the Irredentist agitation was allowed to go on unchecked by the government. The news of the Cyprus Convention was a second severe blow. Cairoli immediately suspected that the French had been bought off by the English, probably by concessions in Tunis.⁷² Soon rumors of an Anglo-French arrangement began to appear in the newspapers.⁷³ Reports of the concentration of the French channel squadron in the Mediterranean and of French designs on Bizerta followed one another rapidly from the leading capitals of Europe and from Tunis itself.⁷⁴

Cairoli had every reason to fear that the loss of the Trentino and Trieste with the aggrandizement of Austria in the Balkans would be followed by the loss of Tunis and the establishment of the French at the very portals of Sicily. He immediately began to take steps to prevent a second catastrophe. Even before Corti returned from Berlin an Italian deputy named Mussi was sent on a special mission to Tunis, ostensibly to take over the Italian consulate temporarily. Just what his mission was is not known, but he was reported to have proposed to the Bey a treaty of amity recognizing Italy's preponderant influence or else the establishment of Bizerta as a free port under the joint guaranty of England, Italy, and France.⁷⁵ It appears also that the Italian government was considering an expedition to Tripoli or possibly to Tunis. In any case the ministers of war and marine resigned with Corti in October because they did not believe the country sufficiently prepared for overseas activities.⁷⁶

At the same time Cairoli made inquiries in London and Paris. Salisbury was absolutely non-committal and confined himself to the statement that England preferred the maintenance of the *status quo* in Tunis. The Italian ambassador, however, had the distinct impression that the English government was not very anxious about

⁷² Cf. his letter to Corti on July 9, 1878, Chiala, II. 110.

⁷³ The story first appeared in *La Liberté* and in the Vienna *Montagsblatt* on July 16, 1878 (Constant, p. 85). The English consul in Tunis also reported to his government on July 23 that there were rumors of an Anglo-French agreement concerning Tunis, *State Papers*, LXXIII. 439-440.

⁷⁴ Chiala, II. 117 ff.; Crispi, pp. 78-79.

⁷⁵ Broadley, I. 171; Chiala, II. 141-142, 158 ff.; Castelnovo, *Il Conflitto Franco-Italiano* (1894), p. 53.

⁷⁶ Count Egon Corti's manuscript article. In his letter of Aug. 15, 1878, the Italian foreign minister writes to King Humbert: "Giunto a Roma trovai il Ministero della marina assai preoccupato della spedizione di Tripoli e cercai d'indurvi la calma, emettendo sei dubbi sull'esecuzione di quello progetto."

the reported French plans.⁷⁷ In Paris, when interpellated by the Italian ambassador, Waddington left no doubt regarding the French view of the balance of power in the Mediterranean, but expressed himself opposed to any further expansion. He furthermore gave assurances that nothing would be done without informing Italy, and, coming back to the idea of compensation which he had discussed with Salisbury, he declared that the French would not make acquisitions without first consulting with Italy as to a *quid pro quo*. Cialdini felt sure that Gambetta and the other republican statesmen would do nothing until the internal situation had cleared.⁷⁸

If Cialdini's prophecy were right there would still be time to do something before the French were ready to act. Cairoli decided to work quickly. Tripoli, which Waddington was evidently willing to abandon to Italy, was but poor compensation for Italian interests in Tunis. Cairoli determined, if possible, to get Tunis itself. In October Signor Maccio was appointed to the Italian consulship in Tunis and from the moment of his ostentatious arrival began the truceless struggle between him and M. Roustan, which led to countless "affairs" and finally precipitated the French invasion.⁷⁹ Corti and the ministers of war and marine resigned rather than associate themselves with so risky an adventure, and with their departure Cairoli felt more free than ever to proceed with vigor.⁸⁰

The French government was not slow to take alarm. On October 13, 1878, the French ambassador in Rome, the Duc de Noailles, was instructed to inform the Italian government that France would not permit any other power to establish itself in the Regency or to occupy any point of it. "It is absolutely necessary that the Italian government understand that it can not hope to conquer Tunis without clashing with the French and without risking a conflict with them."⁸¹ Evidently Cairoli did not take the matter too seriously, for when Maccio arrived at his post the event was made the occasion for

⁷⁷ Chiala, II. 130-132.

⁷⁸ Chiala, II. 134-135; Crispi, pp. 82-83. Waddington told Cialdini that nothing would be done, "assolutamente nulla, senza previo e completo accordo con l'Italia . . . senza prima riconoscere il diritto che avrebbe l'Italia di occupare un altro punto d'importanza relativa e proporzionata".

⁷⁹ Chiala, II. 151-152.

⁸⁰ Chiala, II. 154.

⁸¹ Waddington to Noailles, Oct. 13, 1878, in Lebon, "Les Préliminaires du Traité de Bardo", in *Annales des Sciences Politiques*, 1893, pp. 403 ff., based on official material from the French foreign office. See also Hanotaux, IV. 643; Chiala, pp. 150-151. Chiala tries to prove that Waddington's despatch was not a reply to Maccio's appointment. This is a minor point, for the French obviously had wind of the preparations of the Italians.

a military demonstration, evidently designed to impress the Bey.⁸² Shortly after occurred the first "incident", the so-called Sancy affair. This is not the place to go into the details of a very nice legal question.⁸³ Suffice it to say that M. de Sancy, a French citizen, had some fourteen years before obtained a concession for a ranch, as he meant to "improve the breed of Tunisian horses and cattle". He had not lived up to his agreements, and the Bey, supported by Maccio, abrogated the concession and attempted to expel Sancy from the property. Only the vigorous intervention of the French consul, M. Roustan, saved the day.

The English consul, Sir Richard Wood, who had for years been opposing the French influence, had co-operated with his Italian colleague, either with or without instructions from home. To Waddington it looked as though the English meant to extricate themselves from their promises in a roundabout way. Obviously it was at this time that he drew up the treaty which he meant to force on the Bey.⁸⁴ But before flying in the face of the Italians, and possibly of the English, the cautious Frenchman determined to take soundings. In the first days of January, 1879, St. Vallier paid a visit to Bismarck at Friedrichsruh. But before going he announced to Bülow, the minister of foreign affairs *pro tem.*, that France intended to present the Bey with an ultimatum and perhaps send an expeditionary force to occupy some of the coast towns.⁸⁵ The Germans were not taken by surprise, for Hohenlohe had already on December 20, 1878, reported on the situation in Paris. In other words, Bismarck was well prepared, and on St. Vallier's arrival he spared his visitor all embarrassment by opening the question himself. "Well," he exclaimed, "I believe the Tunisian pear is ripe and that the time has come for you to pick it; the insolence of the Bey has acted like an August sun on this African fruit, which may well rot or be stolen by another if you leave it on the tree too long." So wholeheartedly was he behind the French in this matter that he had not waited to be asked, but had already appealed to Lord Beaconsfield to remember the engagements assumed at Berlin and not to allow Anglo-French relations to be clouded by a "secondary agent"

⁸² Maccio arrived on a gunboat and entered the consulate between two lines of marines, "comme s'il s'était agi d'un coup d'État". Constant, pp. 88-89. Broadley (I. 174) characterizes this as an "almost incredible act of folly". Chiala (II. 154) also condemns the bluster of Maccio's arrival.

⁸³ See Constant, p. 84; Broadley, I. 174 ff.; Chiala, pp. 155 ff.; also *Journal de Droit International Privé*, 1881, pp. 152 ff.

⁸⁴ Constant, p. 172, note; Hippeau, p. 394.

⁸⁵ Bülow to Bismarck, Jan. 2, 1879, *Die Grosse Politik*, III. 387-388.

like Wood. He furthermore promised St. Vallier that if the Italians appealed to him he would tell them that the German government regarded France as being in the right.⁸⁶

It was this very eagerness on Bismarck's part that seems to have made the French suspicious. No doubt the attitude of Gambetta and the acute crisis in France in January acted as deterrents. In any case the French finally contented themselves with the acceptance of a rather mild ultimatum presented to the Bey on January 9.⁸⁷

For Bismarck's motives in thus energetically taking the part of the French we need not rely on conjecture. He himself told St. Vallier plainly and frankly what he had in mind. It must be remembered that Bismarck had a real interest in the crisis which, at the end of January, led to the victory of republicanism and the resignation of MacMahon. The fact was that the German chancellor was anxious to see Waddington remain in power⁸⁸ and that he hoped to satisfy the *amour propre* of the French by assisting them in enterprises in the Mediterranean, France's "natural sphere of expansion". The more success she has in that direction, he told St. Vallier, the less inclined she will be to press her claims against Germany, claims the legitimacy of which he would not discuss but which it would be impossible to satisfy. Of course no French statesman or diplomat could subscribe entirely to this view, and no doubt the realization of Bismarck's motives had something to do with deferring action on the part of the French. At any rate the result of the inquiry was all pure gain for France. Ignoring that "lay clergyman", that "obstinate and clumsy" Salisbury,⁸⁹ Bismarck prevailed on Beaconsfield to reverse the English attitude and recall Wood.⁹⁰

So the first storm passed over. Cairoli had been succeeded on December 17 by Depretis, who determined to pursue a more moderate policy, and, if possible, to re-establish the entente with England.⁹¹

⁸⁶ Herbert Bismarck to Bülow, Jan. 3, 5, 1879, *Die Grosse Politik*, III. 388, 389. See especially St. Vallier's account of the interview in Bourgeois and Pagès, pp. 192, 365, 368, and in Daudet, *Mission du Comte de St. Vallier*, pp. 88-94.

⁸⁷ Broadley, I. 177-178.

⁸⁸ Herbert Bismarck to Radowitz, Nov. 23, 1879, *Die Grosse Politik*, III. 394-395: "Er [Bismarck] hielt es geradezu für eine europäische Notwendigkeit, Waddington in Frankreich am Ruder zu erhalten." Similarly Lucius von Ballhausen, *Bismarck-Erinnerungen*, p. 177 (Sept. 28, 1879) and p. 548 (Nov. 24, 1879), where Bismarck says: "Unsere ganzen Bemühungen sind darauf gerichtet, die jetzigen französischen Staatsmänner am Ruder zu erhalten." Cf. further Bourgeois and Pagès, pp. 193-194.

⁸⁹ Bismarck's expression to St. Vallier. Bourgeois and Pagès, p. 367.

⁹⁰ Constant, p. 79; Newton, *Lord Lyons*, II. 173-174.

⁹¹ Chiala, II. 162. Lebon, *loc. cit.*, p. 407.

In January, and again in February, the Italian ambassador in London approached Lord Salisbury, in the hope of obtaining some sort of declaration, if only to the effect that England favored the maintenance of the *status quo* in Tunis. But the English foreign minister refused to say even that much and insisted on proclaiming the neutrality of England in the whole question.⁹² For the six months of the Depretis ministry the matter rested, and in the meanwhile other affairs claimed the attention of Europe. England and France were busy attempting to straighten out the Egyptian imbroglio, while Bismarck's thoughts turned in another direction.

WILLIAM L. LANGER.

⁹² Crispi, p. 89; Torre, *Come la Francia s'impadronì di Tunisi*, reprinted in Curatulo, *Francia e Italia*, pp. 96-97.

(To be continued.)

NOTES AND SUGGESTIONS

THE NAME "UNITED STATES OF AMERICA" ¹

THE name United States of America appears to have been used for the first time in the Declaration of Independence. At least no earlier instance of its use in that precise form has been found. Its appearance in the Declaration of Independence was not, however, a case of spontaneous generation, but was the result of evolution. Essentially all that Jefferson did in drafting the Declaration of Independence was to substitute "States" for "Colonies" in a title which had been in use for more than a year, although in somewhat varying forms. This substitution was of course in accordance with Richard Henry Lee's resolution of independence offered June 7, which reads: "That these United Colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent States." The latter phrase, in turn, had its immediate origin in the Virginia resolutions of May 15, under which Lee was acting. Nor was this the first instance of the use of the word "states" to designate the group of political entities hitherto known as "colonies", and still generally so called up to the passage of the Declaration of Independence, and often even subsequent to the Declaration. The term (usually in the plural, sometimes in the singular) had come into rather common use among the writers on the subject of independence. For instance, "Candidus" uses the phrase "maritime States" in his letter of February 3, 1776 (Force, *Archives*, fourth ser., IV. 920), and in his letter of March 6 he says: "It remaining, therefore, that the American States are neither the Provinces, Colonies, nor children of Great Britain", etc. (*ibid.*, V. 86). "A Common Man" also uses the phrase "American States" (March 31, *ibid.*, V. 553); and "F. A." (Boston, April 29) says: "Reason tells us, that thirteen powerful States as these Colonies will, separately, be, fifty years hence", etc. (*ibid.*, V. 1133). These are chance examples of the tendency to substitute "states" for "colonies", the latter term definitely connoting dependence. But the history of the term "state" is "another story".

Turning now to the word "United", the first instance of the appearance of the phrase "United Colonies" in the *Journals of Congress* seems to be in a letter from the convention of Massachusetts,

¹ Some phases of the development of the name are pointed out by Mr. John C. Fitzpatrick in an article, "The 'United States of America' and the 'U. S. A.'", in the *Daughters of the American Revolution Magazine*, LIV. 17 (January, 1920), and included in his volume, *The Spirit of the Revolution*.

dated May 16, spread upon the journals of Congress under June 2, 1775. Doubtless earlier instances of the use of the phrase outside of Congress might be found. Under June 7, however, is found a resolution of Congress appointing a day of humiliation, fasting, and prayer, to be observed "throughout the twelve United Colonies". Yet, as this particular phrase does not appear in the original journal, but is incorporated from the "corrected" journal, probably its conception belongs to a later date. At all events, the proclamation actually sent forth (see the *Journals*, June 12) reads: "by the inhabitants of all the English colonies on this continent". Probably the earliest instance of the phrase being actually set down in the records of Congress is in a resolution of June 10, "that it be recommended to the several inhabitants of the united colonies", etc. It is to be observed that this resolution follows recommendations to several groups of colonies, and therefore appears to be used primarily to convey the meaning *all the colonies*, or *the colonies as a whole*.

Nevertheless an official stamp is given to the title in the commission to General Washington, June 17, which begins: "The delegates of the United Colonies of New Hampshire", etc. (In the instructions to Washington, June 20, it is merely "United Colonies", without their several names.) The resolution (June 17) pledging support to Washington, curiously enough, reads: "the delegates of all the colonies, from Nova Scotia to Georgia"; while a committee presents (June 19) a request from General Lee for a conference with a committee consisting of one from each of the "associated colonies".

It is observed that immediately after the appearance of the title "United Colonies" in Washington's commission (it was doubtless used in all the commissions of the time) it begins to appear also in the correspondence of the delegates. For instance, Silas Deane mentions, June 18, that General Putnam has been elected a major-general of the army of "the United Colonies"; Washington, in his letter to John Augustine Washington, June 20, uses the phrase "for the defence of the United Colonies"; and Hancock, in a circular letter of June 27, speaks of the "common Cause of the United Colonies".

From this time the phrase is usually found in the title of official pronouncements and publications, sometimes alone, but generally followed by "of America", or "of North America", frequently preceded by "Twelve" or "Thirteen", as the case might be, and sometimes with the word "English" before "colonies". For instance, the imprint of the Rules for the Troops, June 30, carries the title: "The Twelve United English Colonies of North America". (For other examples see the Bibliographical Notes, in the *Journals*, ed.

Ford, III. 507 ff.) In one instance, at least, the title used is "The United Colonies in Congress" (draft of a declaration to Major-General Howe, January 2, 1776).

The variations "America" and "North America" call for a few observations. In Jefferson's draft of the Declaration on Taking Arms (see the *Journals*, July 6, 1775) the title used is "United Colonies of America"; but in the draft produced by Dickinson the title is "United Colonies of North America"; and as Dickinson's draft formed the basis of the declaration adopted, it is the latter form which for the most part prevailed, except that the published addresses, etc., usually have "Twelve" or "Thirteen" prefixed, and some of them omit the continental appellation. In this connection it is to be observed that the name proposed by Franklin in his sketch of Articles of Confederation is "The United Colonies of North America" (*Journals*, July 21, 1775).

When Jefferson came to draft the Declaration of Independence, he substituted "States" for "Colonies" as a matter of course, in accordance with the resolution of independence. He probably dropped the word "North" as a matter of preference. He had already indicated that preference in his draft of the Declaration on Taking Arms. In framing the Articles of Confederation, Dickinson, although he seems to have had a preference for "North America" as the continental name (as indicated in his draft of the Declaration on Taking Arms), naturally used the title already adopted in the Declaration of Independence.

There was, however, a brief partial lapse from the use of the name "United States of America". In the treaty with France the form used was "The United States of North America", and Congress appears to have felt it to be necessary to conform to the title used in the treaty, at least in drawing bills of exchange on the commissioners in Paris. Accordingly, in determining the forms of those bills (May 19, 1778), the title adopted was "The United States of North America". There must have been an idea in Congress that the name of the union would now take this form; for President Laurens wrote to General Gates that day: "This morning improved our Stile. The United States of North America in conformity to the Treaties of Paris the 6th Feby." And the next day he wrote to Washington: "Congress have adopted the Stile of the Treaties of Paris, 'the United States of North America'." However, on July 11 Congress reconsidered its action of May 19 and resolved to drop the word "North" from the title used on the bills of exchange.

EDMUND C. BURNETT.

DOCUMENTS

The Change of Secession Sentiment in Virginia in 1861.

It is a commonplace of history that Virginia, as one of the border states, was opposed to secession until the crisis precipitated by the firing on Fort Sumter compelled her to choose on which side she would fight when she could no longer refuse to fight. It is felt that the following letters will throw light on the motives of the actors in the very centre of the stage. There are two groups of letters, the first, those of Judge Burks, from a man of keenly logical mind who did not change his fundamental conceptions as he adjusted them to changing conditions, the second, those of Bishop Otey, from a man of high-strung emotional fervor whose extremes of views aptly represent the changing state.

Edward Calohill Burks, of Irish lineage, was born in Bedford County, Virginia, May 20, 1821. He was an honor graduate of Washington College (now Washington and Lee University), and of the Law Department of the University of Virginia. Of frail body, with unusually analytical mind, he gave himself to the study of law, and soon rose to prominence in his own town of Liberty (now Bedford) and in Lynchburg.

In 1877 Mr. Burks took his seat as a justice of the Virginia Court of Appeals, where he served until in the revolutionary times of the "Readjuster" movement in Virginia all conservatives were swept from office. He was the senior member of the commission which codified the laws of Virginia into the Code of 1887, and in 1895 began the publication of the *Virginia Law Register*, of which he was editor until his death July 4, 1897.

Rowland D. Buford, to whom these first letters are written, was for over thirty years clerk of the court of Bedford County and an authority on local and antiquarian history.

James Hervey Otey, author of the second group of letters, was born at the foot of the Peaks of Otter in Bedford County, Virginia, January 27, 1800. Educated at the once famous New London Academy in Bedford County, and at the University of North Carolina, he removed to Tennessee when he was twenty-one, and opened a school for boys near Franklin. In 1829 he was ordained a priest in the Protestant Episcopal Church, but continued his school work, having as one of his pupils the famous Confederate geographer, Matthew

Fontaine Maury. After a picturesque service in frontier conditions he was elected, on January 27, 1833, the first bishop of Tennessee. He died in Memphis, April 23, 1863.

The originals of the first group of letters were loaned to me by Mr. Rowland D. Buford, brother-in-law of Judge Burks; they are now in the possession of Mr. Buford's daughter, Miss Belle Buford, of Bedford, Virginia. Those of the second group were loaned by the son of Edward C. Burks, Judge M. P. Burks, of Lexington, Virginia, who has the originals in his possession.

JAMES ELLIOTT WALMSLEY.

I.

Exchange Hotel, RICHMOND,
January 7, 1861.

Dear Rowland:

The House of Delegates has adjourned¹ and as it is too late to write by mail I hasten to inform you and others of my Bedford friends that the House has just adopted a resolution with great unanimity (102 to 5)² against the coercion of *any* seceding state and declaring that attempted coercion "under existing circumstances" of *any* state will meet the resistance of Virginia. The resolution does not involve the *secession* question at all, but looks to *resistance* by the state of any attempt at the coercion of any state at this time etc.

Times are wild and revolutionary here beyond description. A committee has been appointed to bring in a bill for a convention as soon as practicable. I think it will pass almost *unanimously*. The East under the pressing circumstances will not insist on mixed basis of representation,³ this seems to be conceded. The basis will probably be as now in House of Delegates. I fear the Union is *irretrievably* gone. I am well. So tell my wife. I will write tomorrow to her.

Very hastily yours,

E. C. BURKS.

Exchange Hotel, January 11, 1861.

Dear Rowland:

The House of Delegates have just adjourned after a very exciting session. While we were discussing the Convention Bill, a telegraphic Dispatch was read by a member announcing the firing into the United States "Star of the West" by the Carolinian garrison of Fort Moultrie and her retiring to sea under fire. The announcement was received by clapping of hands and other signs of applause in the galleries and partly upon the

¹ Jan. 7 was the first day of the extra session of the general assembly. An evening session had been held.

² 112 to 5. *Journal*, p. 10.

³ Meaning, in the Virginian parlance of that day, a method whereby the representation of each county was based in equal degree on its proportion of the total white population of the state and on its proportion of the total of state taxation.

floor of the House. Some member remonstrated and a man in the galleries proclaimed that he commenced it and was responsible for it. He said he was from Alabama and spoke of "traitors" in Virginia etc. He was promptly arrested and when first brought in custody of the sergeant to the bar, simply said he had "no apology to make". He was remanded to the custody of the sergeant to await the action of the House at their leisure. He was afterwards brought in, acknowledged his error, said he could not restrain himself upon hearing the Dispatch read and was sorry for it. Thereupon he was discharged and bowed himself out. It was a great breach of decorum.

Martin of Henry, Rutherford of Goochland, and myself had a discussion in the House yesterday upon an amendment offered to the Convention Bill by Collier of Petersburg, requiring the question of "Convention or no Convention" to be voted for by the people at the time of the election of delegates.⁴ I opposed the amendment principally upon the ground that it was unnecessary and especially because it would be construed by the Northern States into timidity etc. and would thus have a bad moral effect. I spoke only a short time and was gratified by the expression of compliments by many members. The speeches were not reported. The two houses have appointed a joint Committee on Federal Relations and I have been honored with a membership, as you will see by the papers. I have also been assigned to the Committee on Military Affairs—the two most laborious committees in the House and the most important. I simply live on excitement—scarcely have time to breathe, none to deliberate.

It is said here that the Virginia Resolution against coercion has caused the coercionists at Washington to pause. The House of Delegates adopted a resolution this evening almost *unanimously* appealing to the President of the United States and the Southern seceding States to pause at the present juncture of affairs and let things remain in *statu quo* for the present.⁵ It will pass the Senate tomorrow I suppose. I trust it will do much good. The Convention Bill progresses slowly. It is read by sections and amendment after amendment is offered. The most important is one requiring the action of the Convention in regard to Virginia's Federal relations to be submitted to the people for ratification before it takes effect. That is still pending. I am inclined to vote against it, as impolitic and unwise now, and because the Legislature has no power to restrict the Convention. I can't say when the bill will be perfected. The 4th of February is the day fixed for the election and the 11th for the meeting of the Convention, unless amended hereafter in that respect.

I am quite comfortably situated here. I am kept so continually excited that I don't know how my health is. I hope I shall be able to get along. Write and let me hear how you all are and how matters are progressing in Bedford. Love to Bettie, the children and all.

Hastily,

E. C. BURKS.

⁴ Offered Jan. 9. *Journal*, p. 16.

⁵ This resolution was passed the day before, Jan. 10. *Ibid.*, p. 19.

Exchange Hotel, RICHMOND, January 14, 1861.

Dear Rowland:

.
The Convention bill passed *finally* this morning both houses—4th day for the election and 13th day for the assembling. Who are to be the candidates in Bedford? Joe Layne (who has been here) told me that I was spoken of. Say to everybody who mentions it, as I said to Layne, that I *will not* be a candidate. Bedford is entitled to two. I think Wm. Goggin ought to be one of them by all means. So say to him if you see him. I have written to him today. I suppose of course Goode⁶ will be—and I reckon Clement. Jordan W. V. will also be out. Without meaning to refer to any particular persons in my remark, I say to you *most emphatically*, that the people cannot be too particular in their selection. It will be the most responsible body of men ever assembled in Virginia. The most conservative men whom I meet here are wild enough for any purpose.

The select joint Committee on Federal relations, of which I am a member, made their report today. You will see it in the papers tomorrow. The scheme for adjustment seems to me the only plausible one I have met with. I doubt not it will be violently assailed by the extreme men in both houses, but I am inclined to think it will pass. I do not say, that it will accomplish anything. I hope it will—I fear it will not. It will at least show some disposition and effort on our part to do something towards settlement. I may say something in the house when it is considered. I do not know however that I shall; as every body, I presume, as usual, will be for letting off steam on it. The Alabama Commissioners address both Houses tomorrow.

There is a great and continued effort here to *hasten* the *impending* resolution—constant Dispatches, sensational paragraphs, startling reports etc. are some of the means resorted to. I do not really look for much good from the Legislature. The people must look to the Convention. *Everything* depends upon it.

Very hastily yours,

E. C. BURKS.

P.S. Write immediately on reception.

E. C. B.

Exchange Hotel, RICHMOND, January 15, 1861.

Dear Rowland:

.
I regret to say that I cannot see much hope for the Union. Seward's last speech⁷ is, to be sure, somewhat conciliatory, but it falls far below the demands of the occasion. I think, however, this much perhaps may be deduced from it—that if secession becomes general amongst the slave holding states, as anticipated, a peaceful policy will be pursued, unless the seceding states pursue an aggressive policy, which I hope will not be

⁶ John Goode, jr. (1829-1909), member of the Confederate House of Representatives 1862-1865, and of the U. S. House of Representatives 1875-1881, solicitor general 1885-1886. He and William L. Goggin were elected to represent Bedford in the convention, and he has given some account of it in his *Recollections of a Lifetime* (Washington, 1906), pp. 42-54.

⁷ Speech of Jan. 12, in the Senate.

done. Although it is only inferential, still I am of opinion, that the policy will probably be to let all the states go out that choose to do so peaceably and let them remain out until the excitement abates, and then call a National Convention for reconstruction etc. These are only deductions of my own. I don't know that anybody concurs with me in that opinion, nor do I know that I am right. I hope Bedford will send her ablest and best men to the Convention. It is no time for trifling. I presume Goggin will be one. Many men here are Disunionists. I am as you know much attached to Goode, and unless he took such extreme position as forbade my support of him, I should vote for him. I hope he will not take such position. I am myself for secession, rather *revolution*, if nothing else will do. But I am for exhausting *every other* measure first. Revolution is the last resort. We expect to take up the resolutions tomorrow reported yesterday by the Committee on State and Federal relations. I am for the scheme embodied in them as one of the peace measures. If I can get an opportunity I may give my views on them before the vote is taken, if I feel well enough and in the right temper. But really everything is done with so much disorder and confusion in our body, that I have not much desire to participate in the discussions. A bill has passed the Senate authorizing the County Court to borrow money, upon their bonds, etc. and arm such of the militia as they think proper. I suppose it will pass our House in a day or two. I will try and send you a copy when it passes. I approve of it. . . .

Hastily,

E. C. BURKS.

P. S. Today, Judge Hopkins⁸ ("Commissioner from the *Sovereign State of Alabama*") addressed the Legislature. It was the lamest and most impotent affair I ever heard. He is imbecile. Almost any boy of 16 could have beaten the effort.

E. C. B.

Exchange Hotel, RICHMOND, January 20, 1861.

Dear Rowland:

Yesterday our plan of adjustment⁹ passed both houses of the Legislature. It was amended somewhat in the Senate taking rather more extreme Southern ground, but we thought we would not hazard delay by further objections. You will see it reported in tomorrows papers. It is a grand Commission of *Peace*, and I trust, it will be attended with some good. It was evidently opposed by extremists here, but a *very large majority* of both Houses favored it. It has engaged my attention day and night for more than a week in committee room and in the house until I am almost prostrated. I hope now I can rest a little. Some of the men on the Commission I do not like, but it was the best we could do. We have passed a bill appropriating \$1,000,000 for *immediate* purposes in defense of the State, a bill creating an ordinance department—a treasury note bill, etc., also a bill (which originated in Senate) authorizing the County Courts to borrow money upon bond etc. for arming such of the militia in the several counties, as they may deem advisable. *All* the

⁸ Arthur F. Hopkins.

⁹ Providing for the Peace Conference.

Justices to be first summoned and a *majority* to be present making the loan etc. You will see the bill in the papers tomorrow. Nothing can be done in Bedford (even if desirable) at next Court, except to summon the justices to February term to consider and determine the matter. It is very questionable whether Bedford *should at this time* do anything. It is a matter however which you all can best determine for yourselves. If possible, I will try and attend Court next Monday and will then confer and talk freely with you all about it. It is doubtful whether any arms can now be purchased. We contemplate sending a Com'r to England as soon as the Ordinance Department is organized to purchase arms etc. for the State. The bill appropriates \$800.00 for that purpose. I fear you will have warm times sure enough, in your canvass for the Convention. I beg the people to maintain as much coolness and deliberation as possible. There is no need of fierce excitement. Indeed, let us all keep our reason and sound judgment in activity as much as possible. We are on the verge of the greatest revolution perhaps the world ever saw. We need not only stout hearts, but *cool heads* also. I tell you in perfect sincerity, that while it *may* become necessary for Virginia to enter or rather *join* in the Revolution, and *she is ready* at this moment, she is as defenceless as a helpless child and the General Government holds possession of her *only* fortifications and they *cannot* now be taken if desirable. Vessels of war can come up York river within 30 miles of this place, and with Fortress Monroe in the possession of the General Government, we *cannot* now hinder them. Just think of that. Nay more. The State has *no arms* of modern structure and none to meet a formidable enemy such as we may anticipate in the event of collision. It will take several months, perhaps six, or more to purchase and get at home the arms we are obliged to have even to *commence* warfare. Then we have no army fit for service—none—none. If we are to fight (God grant we never may!) it will take a *long* time to get ready. Virginia needs *delay*—she *must* have it, or I fear all is lost. This is my deliberate judgment, and if my will could reach every man in my county, I would thus say to him. *Immediate* secession therefore *in my opinion* would be fatal. If come it must (and perhaps it may) let us take time to meet its consequences. Let us nerve ourselves to meet the crisis with patience and firmness. Let us not rush blindly and inconsiderately into the vortex. That is the opinion of some of the coolest and clearest heads here—Democrats too, who acknowledge the *right* of secession, but look to it as the *last resort*. No means should be left untried to secure our rights *in the Union*. When *all* are exhausted and we are ready to meet the consequences, then if it must come, *let it come*.

In the meantime, while we are exhausting all peaceable means at adjustment, looking to the possible, nay probable failure of the effort I shall exert myself to put my State on the substantial war footing. That will take money, a great deal of it, but if we are to be driven into war, we must have the *means* of war. If I can do so I will try and attend next Bedford Court.

In the meantime say to my friends of all parties, candidates and all, take no extreme positions, pledge themselves to no extreme measures, for you may all rest assured that Virginia is not *now prepared* for it. I tell you more, if I mistake not greatly the signs of the times, Virginia is not ready *now* to go out of the Union. Mistake not the apparent unanimity

in the Legislature. *Resolutions* are one thing—*actual secession or dissolution* with them at least quite another. The sequel will show what kind of representatives they will send to the Convention. . . .

Hastily,

E. C. BURKS.

RICHMOND, January 24, 1861.

Dear Rowland:

I have just written to Bettie that I expected to reach home on a visit *Saturday* evening next. I write to you to the same effect for fear my letter may not reach her in time and would thus at least have two chances for communication. Times are much calmer here, owing partially to the absence of exciting news and more probably to the temporary absence of some of our *extremists*.

I suppose from what I hear, that Goode and Goggin will probably be our candidates. I hope all unnecessary agitation of the public mind will be avoided. I hope but *little* for much longer preservation of the Union. I do not think I am as liable as many others to be carried off by the tide of popular feeling, but taking as calm a view of our surroundings as I am capable of, I confess that my hope of preservation of the Union does not amount to any confident expectation. Nor can I say, that I expect preservation of the public peace for a much longer period. We are *rapidly, oh how rapidly*, drifting into anarchy, strife, perhaps conflict. It behooves us all to exercise patience, moderation and wisdom. It is said in this morning's papers, that Ohio, Pennsylvania and New York will probably respond favorably to Virginia's proposition of a conference. I think perhaps all the middle States, North and South will meet as in Convention. If they fail to accomplish anything satisfactory, the failure will operate almost *irresistibly* to drive us *at once* into disunion. What will follow, God only knows. . . .

I say again, that all that can legally be done to arm the county according to the recent act, will be on Monday to have an order made to summon the Justices to February term to consider and determine the subject. I still regard it as very doubtful policy. I wrote Goode more fully on the subject and will confer when I see you all at Court. Clement is here somewhere—saw him last night—says he intends going home tomorrow or next day. . . .

Hastily yours,

E. C. BURKS.

Exchange Hotel, January 31, 1861.

Dear Rowland:

The papers of course will give you the political news more at large and in detail than I can. There seems to be a decidedly better feeling here in regard to our Federal relations. The responses of some of the Northern States to the Virginia proposition for Conference on the 4th instant and the apparent conciliatory tone and temper of some of their men, while the *rejection* by South Carolina of the proffered mediation of Virginia and her declaration that her "separation is final", has lessened the sympathy of many and aroused the indignation of some in respect of her. Evidently at this moment the disunion spirit is flagging, but of

course, it will be revived at the first news of hostilities. South Carolina, I fear, will see this and will do violence to bring about a re-action in her behalf. Look out for it. From conversation with many members of the Legislature and the best intelligence I can get, the approaching Virginia Convention will probably be largely conservative. Its tone, temper and action however may and doubtless will be controlled by subsequent events, which the wisest cannot now foresee. I hope some good may be accomplished by the National Convention of the 4th, but if it fails, I can see no other alternative for Virginia but to separate at once from the old Union and form new connections. I *hope*, but I cannot say that I *expect* the Virginia effort at mediation will be successful. I cannot well see how the present Congress can pass by a *two-thirds* vote any proposition or propositions which may be agreed upon, if acceptable to the South; and still more, I cannot see much prospect, if passed by Congress, for their ratification by the States—for it would have to get three-fourths of all the States which would be the whole of the present Union. Such a thing may be *possible*, but is it at all probable? The chances for adjustment *may* therefore be considered a shade less gloomy, but they are still as dark as *mid-night*.

While I ardently desire the Union to be preserved and reconstructed, I do *not* wish Virginia by any arrangement to be *cut off* from the Southern States and fastened irrevocably to a Northern Confederacy. If there *must* be two confederacies, I would take my chances with Southern.

Write me at once and let me know how the canvass is progressing in Bedford—who are most likely to be elected—what positions are taken by the respective candidates—what combinations, if any, are being made. . . .

Yours etc.,

E. C. BURKS.

Exchange Hotel, February 3, 1861.

Dear Rowland:

No news here. I heard Botts speak last night.¹⁰ He is running for the Convention as an out and out Union man—is willing to accept *any* adjustment whatever, and it seems to be thought he will be elected. I should regret it very much, for he will damage any conservative action of the Convention and injure our cause North and South. McFarland and Johnson (two conservative men) will also probably be elected here, so it is said, but the whole matter I think, is very doubtful.¹¹ I think most men here believe that a majority of Conservatives will be elected to the Convention, but I think it will be found upon examination that there are several grades of these called Conservatives, between many of whom and the “immediate secessionists” there will be but little difference.

Brokenborough, Tyler, and Seddon passed through last night *enroute* for Washington. Summers, I presume, went by way of Parkersburg.¹²

¹⁰ John Minor Botts.

¹¹ William H. Macfarland, Marmaduke Johnson, and George W. Randolph were elected to the convention from Richmond city.

¹² The representatives sent by Virginia to the Peace Conference were John Tyler, William C. Rives, John W. Brockenbrough, George W. Summers, and James A. Seddon.

It seems to be thought by many here that an adjustment will be effected. I learn Tyler so thinks decidedly. I doubt it. . . .

Very truly yours,

E. C. BURKS.

Spottswood House, RICHMOND,
February 18, 1861.

Dear Rowland:

.
It seems to be generally thought here that the Conservative men have a very decided majority in the Convention. I don't think there can be any doubt about it although no test vote has yet been made. What I most fear is that they will be too conservative. From the manner in which I hear some of them talk, I don't think secession in any event very probable. Even in the event Congress fails, it will not surprise me if a majority of the body oppose secession or resistance out and out. I *may* be mistaken, but I don't think I am. The Commissioners from South Carolina and other seceded states are now addressing the Convention.¹³ I was entitled to a privilege seat as a member of the Ho. of Delegates, but found on application that it was impossible, or next thing to it, to get in. I accordingly retired, not caring much about hearing anyway; certainly not so much as to run the risk of being mashed to death; for I never saw such immense throng in my life, and hundreds, I presume failed to get in at all. . . .

Yours,

E. C. BURKS.

Spottswood House, February 21, 1861.

Dear Rowland:

.
I have no news of importance beyond what the papers will furnish you. I sent you on yesterday the "Richmond Enquirer" containing the speech of Preston (Com'r from South Carolina). It was perhaps the finest address I ever listened to. It will doubtless read well, but cannot carry the same force as when delivered, accompanied as the delivery was with graces and other attributes of the most finished oratory. When you have read it, send it to Bettie. I wrote her to that effect. I wish the paper preserved. Get from her also, after she has read it, the New York Herald which I sent her, containing the speeches of the French Counsel in the Bonaparte suit. These last are of the most intense interest, as furnishing one of the most romantic stories to be found in modern times—the history of the marriage of Jerome Bonaparte with Miss Patterson of Baltimore and the sequel thereto. Do not mislay the paper. The Legislature and Convention adjourned today until Saturday, tomorrow being the 22nd. I suppose we shall have a great parade of the Military here. Some of the members talk of going to Washington City tonight and I have been invited to accompany them, but am hesitating about going as I almost fear to venture so far having been somewhat unwell for a day or two. . . .

¹³ The commissioners from Mississippi and Georgia addressed the convention on Feb. 18, John S. Preston of South Carolina on Feb. 19.

The Convention has done nothing yet, beyond offering and refusing resolutions. It is not known when the Committee of 21 on Federal Relations will report. I think the Convention is much divided in sentiment, and the precise position of most or at least many of the members is not known, as no test votes have yet been taken. I am very much inclined to the opinion that the body is *too conservative* for the times. They seem to be afraid to take any definite action. Perhaps however the matter will all work out right in the end, although I much fear the result.

The proceedings will for the future be reported in full in the "Richmond Enquirer" according to a resolution of the Convention which you will see in the papers. I would advise you to take the paper, if you want to keep fully up. It will be the only paper, I presume, with full and accurate reports. . . .

Your friend etc.,

E. C. BURKS.

P. S. Tell Fannie, I went to a concert last night at the Metropolitan Hall and heard "Dixie's Land". It was first rate music. I met with an old law student who was with me at the University, Dick Noland of Albe-marle. He said he intended sending her the words, so she may expect them in a few days.

E. C. B.

Spottswood House, February 26, 1861.

Dear Rowland:

I directed the daily "Richmond Enquirer" to be forwarded to you for six months. It will commence with today's number so at least I directed. In it you will find the commencement of Goode's speech in reply to Sam Moore¹⁴ and also Moore's at length. Goode finished his speech this morning, I hear, and Goggin followed and after speaking *two hours* without finishing, Convention adjourned. He will conclude tomorrow I suppose. If I am any judge, I don't think either of the gentlemen did any big things. I think I heard about the same speeches on Court day before election. This however *inter nos*, as you know I am partial to both of them. Although Goggin spoke *two hours*, not a member of the Convention or bye stander was able to place him. The *mob* of the city, as I am informed, proposed to burn Sam Moore in effigy last night but were dissuaded by Goode and others from it. They seconded Goode and played the "rogue's March" for old Sam. They are evidently waking up the "sleeping lion" without knowing it. The whole affair was a most disgraceful outrage and merits the indignation of all right-thinking men. I read Moore's speech and there is nothing in it to call for such demonstration.

I presume the clearing of the galleries was the principal cause of the disturbance. If such things are repeated I wouldn't be surprised if it terminated in the adjournment of the Convention to another place to hold its sessions. It is already talked of, if not seriously meditated. You will see the speeches in the morning's "Enquirer". The local of the "Whig" contains proceedings of the mob. . . .

Hastily yours,

E. C. BURKS.

¹⁴ Samuel McD. Moore, member from Rockbridge.

Spottswood House, March 6, 1861.

Dear Rowland:

The Legislature today was engaged in considering the Free negro bill, amendatory of the Act in the Code for voluntary enslavement, and dispensing with all compensation to the state and otherwise facilitating enslavement. I offered several amendments which were adopted and the bill was ordered to its engrossment. It will pass our House, I think, but it is said will probably be defeated in the Senate. The negro enslaved is *protected* against the debts of the master selected and his heirs and legatees. I tried to amend in part in this respect by striking out "heirs and legatees", but was ruled out of order by the speaker, the *whole* section having been previously retained on motion to strike out the *entire* section. If I could have got a fair chance at it, I think my amendment would have been adopted. There are some other objections to the bill, but I think I shall vote for it on its passage.

Convention did nothing today but make and hear speeches. Flournoy and Thornton of Prince Edward made fine speeches, as I hear. I was not present. They were strong against coercion. I suppose you will get their speeches in tomorrow's "Enquirer". By the way, upon inquiry according to your request I was informed by one of the Editors that your papers were mailed regularly.

The *resistance* fever is evidently largely on the increase since Lincoln's Inaugural, both here and, as I learn, generally over the State. It is thought that the Convention this week will adopt *strong resistance* resolutions. I am informed that the Committee on "Federal Relations" will make full report tomorrow on coercion and other matters. Many members of Convention hitherto hesitating, are ripe *now* for *resistance* and for an ordinance of secession. If they don't move *now*, I can hardly imagine circumstances which will move them. I consider myself that the argument for union is exhausted and that the old Dominion should speak with one voice from the Ohio to the Chesapeake in tones of defiance to Lincoln and all his cohorts resolving to resist this policy and organize the forces of the State to carry out their resolution. By the way, when the Inaugural arrived I went to Goode's room and drew up *two* resolutions which expressed my views and he said accorded with his upon that subject, and he promised to offer them but didn't get a chance. He tells me, the resistance men had a meeting last night and *unanimously* adopted them as expression of their views and that they met the views of all with whom he has consulted and it is agreed at the proper time to be submitted to the Convention as expressing the opinion of that division, and he tells me that Flournoy and Thornton today occupied the precise ground contained in them. I confess that I feel a little flattered at their reception, drawn up as they were in a few minutes on the telegraphic communication of the Inaugural. They ought to have been offered and *promptly* adopted yesterday morning as soon as the Convention met. Goode, I presume, will offer them at the proper time and *father* them. When they appear I will point them out to you. There are only two and they are very brief—purposely so, but covering, I think the whole ground perfectly. You will find them quite strong but, I think, not too much so for the occasion. All I have written about my connection with these resolutions will of course be considered *confidential* by you, *not* because they do not express the views

which I entertain and daily avow in public, but because I desire Goode to have the *paternity* of them in the Convention. Goggin made a strong resistance speech yesterday that seems to have given much satisfaction. His resolutions however are badly drawn and couched in very awkward and clumsy language and *seem to me* to be somewhat inconsistent with themselves. However they are *unquestionably* his *own* production.

The Senate adopted a resolution today to adjourn on the 20th with the concurrence of the House. I hope we may be able to adjourn on that day, but think it doubtful, for I see from indications in the Convention that they are talking of instructing us to organize more perfectly the military system of the State. If they do that and we are compelled to wait on the Convention, there is no telling when we will get away. If they don't adjourn I intend at least to visit you all about that time. I am very anxious to get home, but in these critical and perilous times I am willing to make great personal sacrifices for the public good, if necessary. . . .

I wrote Bettie this evening. My kind regards to all friends, and say to them and *all* the good people of my county to *rouse* up to the emergency and stand as *one man* for Virginia and the entire South against any and all attempts by Lincoln or any of his abettors to make war upon *any* of the Southern States. It is our *only* hope. I see *no* prospect of adjustment immediately in view, and *war*, in my candid opinion, is at our very doors. I am constantly in expectation of news of a warlike demonstration by the Southern States, and while I deprecate it with all my heart as a great calamity, I cannot see how the Southern seceded States can longer forbear after Lincoln's tender of *submission* on their part or *war* on his part. I think we may reasonably expect it very soon. Perhaps it is progressing while I write. It wouldn't surprise me if it were so. Lincoln hasn't one element of a statesman in him, or he never would have thus foolishly, unnecessarily, and wickedly have jeopardized the peace and safety of the country. If war begins, like Davis and Wise, I would be for gathering the Southern forces and marching arms in hand to the Federal Capitol and seizing the old stars and stripes I would drive the usurper from the seat of Washington and run up the flag of our revolutionary fathers upon the State house and bid all patriots North and South to rally around it.

Yours etc.,

E. C. BURKS.

Spottswood House, March 11, 1861.

Dear Rowland:

.
You will have seen by the papers of today, that the Committee on "Federal Relations" in the Convention on Saturday made report *in part* from *several* reports—a majority report—a minority report—a report by Mr. Wise—and a report by Mr. Barbour—and, I learn, that a *fifth* was made today by John Baldwin; all differing more or less, and some of them *widely*. This shows the distraction and division in the Convention. The amendments to be proposed to the Constitution have *yet* to be considered and determined upon by the Committee, as you will see from the majority report. They will embrace the kernel of the nut yet to be cracked, and will probably give rise to great dissension and

greater varieties of differences than all else—some perhaps will go for the Crittenden Proposition simply, some for these modified in one way some in another, some for the Peace Conference scheme, while some will go for others more exacting, and many will be opposed to all. So we go. There is so much dissension amongst the members, that I do not think they ever will agree upon anything which, it seems to me, the exigencies of the occasion demand. The majority report, I think, *under all the circumstances* (so far as it goes) comes nearest to the mark. The principles enunciated for the most part are satisfactory. But it deals too much in generalities, on the question of coercion, I think it does not go far enough, although it takes higher ground than I feared at one time the committee would take. You will observe, that it declares that Virginia would “*expect* as an indispensable condition” etc., that the Southern forts should not be re-inforced, that the Federal Government should not *re-take* the forts now in possession of the Seceded States, nor *collect* the *revenue*, nor do anything justly calculated to provoke hostilities. That is the substance. I quote from memory. You will perceive, that it does not, as I think it should do, *pledge* the state to *resistance* in the event these conditions are broken by the General Government. If they will insert the word “demand” or “require” or something equivalent instead of “expect”, and amongst the conditions include the *evacuation* of the Southern forts by the General Government, and *pledge* the State to co-operate with the Southern Seceded States in *resisting* by *force* any break of these conditions by the General Government, it will do. These alterations made, if you will recur to my last letter or the letter in which I mentioned having drawn certain resolutions in Goode’s possession, you will find that the report would *then* express my views pretty accurately on the subject of coercion. If I believed the people of the State at large were ready for it, I would prefer *immediate secession*; for to that complexion at last, I fear, things must come. But under the instructions “for reference” at the late election, an ordinance of secession must necessarily be referred to *them* for ratification, if adopted by the Convention; and if referred now, my conviction is strong, that it would be *rejected*, and a *rejection* would bind the state to *irremediable submission* or produce a *revolution* in the state perhaps a *final separation* of its two sections; an event too deplorable to contemplate. Strongly impressed with the opinion that secession *now* would be voted down and thus leave us in a *hopeless* condition, and that the current of events is fast inclining the minds of men to separation and that the day is not very distant when the people of Virginia will be of *one mind* on that subject, I am disposed to await the result without attempting to hasten it, and in the mean time to *prepare* to maintain by force, if necessary, the position which we shall be compelled to take. The people of Bedford will bear me witness, that on the day they nominated me for a seat in the Legislature, in my address to them I declared, that if they elected me I should go for arming the State effectually, cost what it might. I think my language was “if it took the last dollar out of their pockets and mine”. I was then somewhat in advance of public sentiment, but I thought I foresaw something of the present state of things. Accordingly, ever since I have been here I have been endeavoring to effect that object. The Committee on Military Affairs in the House, of which I am a member, more than two months ago or about that length of time, reported three bills—one creating an Ordinance De-

partment—another appropriating \$1,000,000 for purchase of arms—and another authorizing the raising of the million by the issue of treasury notes. These bills were promptly passed by the House of Delegates. But will you believe me when I tell you that the Senate has never passed the treasury note bill upon which the other two depend until last Saturday, and then stuck an amendment on it, leaving the issue of the notes wholly in the discretion of the Convention? Indeed I believe it only passed today. It has to be returned to our House to be acted upon before it becomes a law. When it does come back, if no other member will do it, I will move to disagree with the Senate in their amendment. In my estimation, this has been a most shameless trifling with the decent rights of the people. We shall have to send to England to buy the arms—the ordinance officers who will have the management of it have first to be appointed—and all this will, as you know, take considerable time. As it is, we are as defenseless now as when the Legislature first met. The pretext is, that the Convention would not do anything—and that peace would probably be restored and adjustment etc. That is all child's talk. We want them ready to meet any emergency that may arise and in my opinion there never was a wiser appropriation than this million of dollars. My skirts are clear, but I am indignant at the timidity and imbecility that seems to have seized on the representatives of the State in part. If hostilities should commence in a short time, how will these men feel, when they hear the cries of the people for arms. . . .

Summers commenced his speech in Convention today on the proceedings of the late Peace Congress. After speaking about 2 hours without finishing, the Convention adjourned. Presume he will conclude tomorrow. I didn't hear him. It is said he spoke with ability. Take care of your "Enquirers" as they may be useful hereafter and certainly will be interesting some day, if not now. I would be glad to see you here. Goode still in bed—don't improve much, if any, has but little appetite and is restless, I told him today that for once in his life he had to become a "submissionist".

Present me kindly to my friends—especially to Mr. Sale and Mr. Wharton. I think you may call this an "omnibus" letter too. But when I get to writing on the exciting topics of the day, I don't know when or where to stop. The news by telegraph here tonight, is, that Lincoln is about to recall the forces from Fort Sumter. He had better do it and that quickly. However I don't put much credit in the telegraph. I wouldn't be surprised if many of the messages originated in this place—such is human depravity.

Yours etc.,

E. C. BURKS.

Spotswood House, March 12, 1861.

Dear Rowland:

I think a meeting of the people of Bedford ought to be called for March Court to consider further our present crisis. Give notice of it in both county papers. I will endeavor to draw and present some resolutions. Don't connect my name with it.

Hastily yours,

E. C. BURKS.

RESOLUTIONS DRAWN BY JUDGE BURKS AND ADOPTED BY MASS
MEETING IN BEDFORD COUNTY.¹⁵

At a large and enthusiastic meeting of the people of Bedford County, on Court day, on motion, William G. Claytor was called to the Chair, and on motion of Wm. V. Jordan, Esq., John R. Thurman and L. A. Sale were appointed Secretaries of the meeting.

The following resolutions were then passed to the Chair, read and adopted with four dissenting votes:

The people of Bedford County in General Meeting assembled, on the 25th of March, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-one and of the Commonwealth the eighty-fifth, to consider of their rights and interests involved in the great struggle now pending between the people of the different sections of a once united but now broken Confederacy, after free conference make known and declare:

1. That they recognize the fact, that seven out of the fifteen slave holding States of our Confederacy for causes by them deemed just have resumed to themselves respectively all the powers previously delegated to the Federal Government, thereby effectually dissolving their political association with the other States, and, as separate, sovereign and independent communities, in the exercise of the powers thus resumed, have adopted and established a new Federal Compact with the title of "Confederate States of America," laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form as to them seemed most likely to effect their common safety and happiness.

2. That there is no power in the Government of the United States under the Constitution and laws made in pursuance thereof to make war upon the said Confederate States or upon any of them by reason of their refusal to render obedience to the Government of the United States; and any attempt on the part of the Government of the United States to make such war upon them or to enforce its laws within the limits and jurisdiction of the said Confederate States against their consent, would be flagrant usurpation of power, a direct invasion of the rights of the States and dangerous to the liberties of the American people.

3. That the people of Virginia could never acquiesce in the exercise of such power for such purposes by a [*words uncertain*] Government of the United States, but impelled by a just and natural sympathy, and by a due regard to their honor, safety and plighted faith, they would unite with the Confederate States, and "with all the means in their power" make common resistance to a common wrong.

4. That the State of Virginia, not disclaiming the right which she expressly reserved to herself when she "assented to and ratified" the Constitution of the United States to resume the powers granted thereunder whenever the same should be perverted to her injury and oppression, but being willing to postpone the exercise of the same until she had exhausted all reasonable means to obtain for herself and her sister slave-holding States adequate constitutional guarantees against future "injury and oppression", for that purpose invited a Conference of all the States of the Union, expressly declaring to them and to the world, that it was

¹⁵ These resolutions were clipped from a Lynchburg newspaper, presumably; the clipping kept by Mr. Buford has neither date nor heading.

"a final effort to restore the Constitution and the Union in the spirit in which they were established by the Fathers of the Republic".

5. That this "final effort" having signally and notoriously failed in accomplishing the objects for which it was made, it becomes the duty as it is the right of the people of this State in Convention assembled to resume to themselves all the powers at any time heretofore delegated to the Government of the United States, and to concert proper measures to obtain from the other States an equitable share of the common property.

6. That after such resumption of powers, proper efforts should be made to construct a Confederacy amongst all the slaveholding States upon such terms "as to them shall seem most likely to effect their common safety and happiness"; and if the said efforts should be successful, after the establishment of the said Confederacy, the concurrence of the parties to [the same having been secured, (?)] such of the non-slaveholding States should be admitted into the Confederacy as may be willing to accept its terms.

7. That we earnestly remonstrate against any attempt in the Convention of the people of the State to disturb at this time the question of taxation and representation fixed by our State Constitution, as not contemplated in the call of the Convention, as hurtful if not fatal to the best interests of the Commonwealth, calculated to produce and aggravate dissensions and divisions amongst our own people, impairing our own strength, inviting further aggression upon our rights from the Federal Government and the Northern States, and tending to excite and organize a revolutionary struggle between sections in the State.

The meeting was addressed in eloquent Southern-Rights speeches by Edward C. Burks, and Wm. M. Burwell, Esq's, and much enthusiasm prevailed.

Spotswood House, March 14, 1861.

Dear Rowland:

The treasury note bill (one million of dollars) for arming the state was returned to us today from the Senate after about 2 months *sleep*. There was a stratagem to defeat it in the senate, which was unsuccessfully renewed in the House. We had a full House, some spectators and a spicy debate. Feeling much interest in the success of the bill, I made a short speech in advocacy of it. The chief opposition, I believe the *only* opposition, came from Western members, who prated as usual about East and West, and growled about the inequality of taxation, the exemption of slaves under 12 years of age etc. It was in bad taste and, I am sorry to say, in worse temper. They did not hesitate to avow the purpose on the part of their representatives in the Convention to change the system of taxation and make it *ad valorem* on all property (slaves included); and that they would be satisfied with nothing else. The scheme was to pass the bill and leave it *discretionary* with the *Convention* to use the money or not; and thus furnish the West in Convention with a pretext to alter the compromises of the State Constitution and give them a lever power to operate with. But, I rejoice to say, that the stratagem met a signal defeat. I hope now the Governor will be *without excuse* in organizing the Ordinance Department, and that arms will be promptly procured for our people. If he had promptly organized the Ordinance Depart-

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXXI.—7.

ment *two months* ago, as he might and ought to have done and the Senate had promptly responded to the action of the House, we might have had our arms here this day. There had been culpable neglect both in the Senate and with the Governor; and if hostilities ensue before we get our arms, no part of the blame can attach to the House of Delegates. They at least have been prompt and decided. I hope to get home last of next week whether the Legislature adjourns or not. I intend to prepare some resolutions for the consideration of the people. I shall take high ground. It is time it was taken everywhere. Whether the Convention adopts it or not, I think the people had better plant themselves *firmly* on *withdrawal* from the Union and resistance to Federal oppression. Separation, I think *must* come, and we had better at once (all of us) look it straight in the face. If we don't do something *at once*, I tell you, I believe, the State will become first demoralized and then *abolitionized*. We are in *great* difficulties and I cannot see what is to become of us. . . .

Hastily etc.,

E. C. BURKS.

II.

MEMPHIS, November 23, 1860.

*My dear Friend:*¹⁶

. . . . I wish I could think our National difficulties growing out of the presidential election would be as easily adjusted.¹⁷ The course of S. C. I look upon as infamous. There is not a redeeming trait about the movement to save it from the just and deep condemnation of Posterity. The morning's dispatches let in some gleams of light. The Cotton States will not because they cannot go together in this movement. Leave the question of union or disunion to the people tomorrow morning and I verily believe that a majority in S. C. and in all the Southern States will vote for Union. They will be ready to fight—so am I—but under the constitution. I want to see Buchanan impeached and tried for neglecting to enforce the laws. Had he done his duty as Filmore and Jackson and throttled nullification all this fuss had been ended long ago. "*But the Lord God omnipotent reigneth!*" therein is my hope and strength. The Peaks of Otter still stand firm. Under their shadow I can yet find a resting place.

Love to your family.

Affectionately,

JAS. H. OTEY.

MEMPHIS, March 12, 1861.

My dear Friend:

Your very welcome letter of March 3rd reached me a few days ago and gave me unwonted pleasure. We have fallen on evil times, and almost all we hear and read in the shape of news of the day fills us with fears and painful apprehensions. I had been meditating on writing you some weeks past, when your letter came, but various causes and reasons

¹⁶ This letter and the four which follow were written to Edward C. Burks. Extracts from letters of intervening dates, Dec. 8, 1860, May 7, May 24, June 20, 1861, may be found in Bishop W. M. Green's *Memoir of Rt. Rev. James Hervey Otey* (New York, 1885), pp. 91-94.

¹⁷ Referring to a business matter just mentioned.

interfered to prevent me; and among them I had been made aware by information from James Buford, whom I saw at Bristol, about a month since, that you were a member of the Legislature, and it occurred to me that your thoughts would be so much occupied with important duties in your new vocation of law-making etc. that my lucubrations would wear the appearance of intrusion. I have also been in feeble health since my return last month, and am yet an invalid, very seldom leaving my house except to attend Church daily-prayers, a few steps from my door. . . .

In reference to the distracted state of our country and the evils that threaten us, I shall say only a few words. Your own labors have been directed to the end which I would naturally suppose they would be—the preservation of peace, conciliation and reconciliation. But I fear with you that all such efforts will avail nothing. “*Silent leges inter arma*” is a maxim approved by the experience of the world since the days of the great Roman orator. If I could divest myself of a settled conviction which has for years rested upon my mind, namely that there has existed for 25 years in this country, a party that has only sought for a pretext and an opportunity to go out of the Union, or in other words to dismember the government, I should have some confidence in the wise and peaceable measures which many good and patriotic men have proposed as remedies for our existing and coming evils. But those to whom I refer can be satisfied with nothing short of power—they well illustrate the terrible conception of the poet who represents the madness of ambition as preferring to reign in Hell, rather than serve in Heaven. I look upon dissolution of the Union or the organization of two governments North and South, dividing upon the question of slavery, not only as setting the seal to the ruin of both, but especially as settling the destiny of slavery to speedy inevitable extinction, as certainly as the sun’s rays fall upon the Earth when he rises to usher in the day. It will deprive the institution of that moral support which it now derives from its being upheld by a government over 30 millions of people. It will bring Canada into juxtaposition with the slaveholding States. The same causes which are now in operation to disturb the institution will then exist in ten-fold vigor. Who thinks of demanding the rendition of an escaped or fugitive slave at the hands of the British government? The idea is simply preposterous. And will it be otherwise when the non-holding States are set off to themselves? Never! ! They will make no such treaty stipulations and we shall not have the color of law or pretext to demand them.

In our Revolutionary struggle our Forefathers invoked the protection of Heaven to defend and its wisdom to guide them in the difficulties surrounding them. They asked for the light of experience to assist them to safe conclusions. How is it with the Secessionists? Denunciation—defiance and menace dwell upon their lips. One would think that men engaged in breaking up a great government (a government that has attracted the admiring gaze and draws around it the hopes of a world) and in constructing a new one out of the fragments, they would feel themselves burdened by the weight of responsibility that would make them serious—nay, tremble and fear. Everything exhibits a different state of mind. *They can whip all creation*—Cotton will make them “princes and rulers in all lands”! Depend upon it, this is the pride that goes before a fall. God will make our own passions—our Covetousness, pride and ambition the executioners of his wrath. The day of vengeance I

verily believe is near at hand. My only comfort is that the "*Lord God omnipotent reigneth*". I shall direct this letter to Liberty, as I see that it is expected your body will soon adjourn. Dispatches last night shed a gleam of light on the surrounding darkness—that the President will give up the Forts of the South. I hope he will yield all that has been demanded as the shortest way to convince folly of its crime and treason of its guilt.

Love to all.

Yours faithfully,

JAS. H. OTEY.

BEERSHEBA SPRINGS, July 17, 1861.

My dear Friend:

I can and do enter deeply into the feelings you have for the troubles of our distracted country. Your views, like mine, I doubt not, have undergone a great change in regard to the moral aspect of the contest. Since Mr. Lincoln's proclamation, and the attitude assumed, and the purposes proclaimed by the North, I have had no sympathy with the U. S. Government—no respect for its rulers—very little regard for the Northern people. Our duty is clearly and unequivocally to repel force by force, and to make every sacrifice rather than to submit to an administration that tramples down every barrier raised by our Forefathers for the protection of personal, social and public rights. . . .

Yours as ever,

JAS. H. OTEY.

BEERSHEBA SPRINGS, August 7, 1861.

My dear Mr. Burks:

The same old story. Got home last night after an absence of 12 days to find your letter that came during the interval. I am rejoiced to learn that our native county has acquitted herself so well in the persons of her sons at Manassas. She has never been found wanting when the call was made on her for either head or heart and I trust she never will be. . . .

I do hope that another such battle as Manassas will put an end to the war. The idea of an invader treading on the soil within sight of the Peaks of Otter makes my blood hot. I think if I heard that he was at Liberty I should go to the army anyhow. I hope I may not hear it. Our Bedford boys I think will be a match for every Buckeye that crosses the Blue Ridge. O if I were only 20 years of age! But what avail regrets. Let us live hopeful and trust in God. I write hurriedly to save the mail. My love to your wife and children.

Yours affectionately,

JAS. H. OTEY.

P. S. Our Tennessee boys are on the way to or are actually in Mo. I hope they will give a good account of that butcher Lyons.

BEERSHEBA SPRINGS, August 22, 1861.

My dear Mr. Burks:

The fact is the Government at Washington is infamous in its principles and unscrupulous in the use of any means that give promise of suc-

cess. They lie as though truth were a thing unknown among men. And yet every means they have adopted in the prosecution of *the war against the South*, has demonstrated their stupidity and weakened their own cause. Their confiscation bill will operate more effectually upon those portions of Maryland, Va., Ky, and Mo. which they wish to hold to their allegiance than any other states. Their blockade is injuring their foreign and domestic trade almost beyond computation and their false reports in regard to battles etc. only rebound with doubly depressing effect upon their friends and allies when the truth is told, which sooner or later it must be.

If our army about the Potomac is successful in the next encounter, as I devoutly hope and pray it may be, the Administration of the U. S. government must go down—their own people will overthrow it and being overthrown, it is a possible thing that the union of the states may follow. Stranger things than this have happened in our world.

Your faithful friend,

JAS. H. OTEY.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

GENERAL BOOKS AND BOOKS OF ANCIENT HISTORY

Warfare: a Study of Military Methods from the Earliest Times.

By OLIVER LYMAN SPAULDING, JR., Colonel, Field Artillery, United States Army; HOFFMAN NICKERSON, formerly Captain, United States Army; and JOHN WOMACK WRIGHT, Colonel, Infantry, United States Army. With a Preface by General TASKER H. BLISS. (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Company. 1925. Pp. xiii, 601. \$5.00.)

A BRIEF preface by General Tasker H. Bliss emphasizes the value of a study of this type which calls attention to the unchanging character of the principles upon which the science of warfare is based, however the conditions under which wars have been fought may have varied from one age to another. In their introduction the authors state the scope of their work; they do not seek to write a complete history of warfare, but merely to give a continuous narrative which may serve as the starting-point for further studies in military institutions. As the terminal point of this narrative they have selected the death of Frederick the Great, because after him begins the "epoch of modern tactical systems" and the period of the reciprocal influence of America and Europe. The book is divided into three parts: (I.) Ancient Warfare, to the Death of Julius Caesar, by Colonel Spaulding; (II.) Warfare in the Roman Empire, the Dark and Middle Ages, to 1494 A.D., by Captain Nickerson; (III.) Warfare in Modern Times, to the Death of Frederick the Great, by Colonels Spaulding and Wright. It is well supplied with maps and plans, and there is a good general index. Each part has a select bibliography.

In part I. the narrative is clear and scholarly and reveals the author as a careful student alike of the sources and the secondary literature. However, a few suggestions and criticisms appear in place. For a possible basis for calculating the Persian military strength (pp. 33, 44, 52), one might consult E. Obst, *Der Feldzug des Xerxes* (1913), and perhaps a truer estimate of the strategy of Themistocles would cause modification of the dictum (p. 54) that "the Persian Wars were Spartan Wars". Most students of Roman history will challenge the attribution of the centuriate organization to Servius Tullius (pp. 102-103), as it was more probably a gradual development of the fifth century. On the numbers engaged at Cannae (p. 125), reference should be made to De Sanctis, *Storia dei Romani*, III. 2, pp. 131 ff. One looks in vain for any mention of the development of the Roman system of military roads in Italy, and

the bibliography should include a history of Greece of the type of J. B. Bury's.

Part II., particularly in its opening chapters, does not create the same favorable impression as the preceding section. It is marked by considerable dogmatism, by impatience with views of which the author does not approve, and by a neglect of important modern literature. The gratuitous assertion (p. 281) that there is "no reason for rejecting the date of the foundation of Rome itself in 753 B.C." will alone cause one to question the author's grasp of the problems of Roman history. Among the specific criticisms that may be made of the text are the following. The description given of the Principate (p. 192) belongs to the third century and not to the time of Augustus. The old universal obligation to military service was by no means a dead letter after the reforms of Augustus (p. 193). The tenth praetorian cohort was added by Tiberius (p. 195). It may be questioned whether it is correct to divide the military policy of the Principate into an offensive period to 117 A.D. and a defensive period from then until 337 A.D. Strictly speaking, from the time of Augustus the Roman army was really only a border garrison. Hadrian's administration merely marks a stricter return to the advice of Augustus, in which other motives than those mentioned by the writer played an important part. This would be brought out if the gradual development of the *limites* prior to Hadrian had been traced and it had been pointed out that Domitian and not Hadrian should be credited with quartering the legions in single camps. On the other hand, one of Hadrian's most important innovations—the development of territorial recruitment for the legions—is not specifically mentioned. The choice of the military operations described seems very haphazard: Britain is emphasized to the neglect of the northern and eastern frontiers, the civil wars of 68–69 and 192–197 are omitted, and the account of the campaigns of Marcus Aurelius ends with 172 A.D. The havoc of the civil wars and invasions of the third century seems to be seriously understated. The Masters of the Infantry and Cavalry were introduced by Constantine, not Diocletian (p. 238). It is almost certain that the units of the Roman army in the fourth and fifth centuries were not kept at full strength. The influence of the barbarian recruits upon the change of armor and the decline of Roman discipline is neglected, and the independence of the *foederati* is greatly underestimated (p. 256). The chapters on the Dark and Middle Ages offer less ground for criticism, but one is surprised not to find the least allusion to developments north of the Alps. This whole part would gain in clearness by the division of the chapters into topical sections, as is done in the other two parts. The bibliography here lacks any modern study of the Principate and does not contain a single reference to a German work, in spite of the fundamental studies of Mommsen, von Domaszewski and Delbrück.

Part III. shows the same pleasing characteristics of clarity and scholarship that distinguish part I.

A. E. R. BOAK.

The Prophets and their Times. By J. M. POWIS SMITH, Professor of the Old Testament Language and Literature in the University of Chicago. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1925. Pp. ix, 277. \$2.25.)

THE prophets were religious geniuses. They were men who transcended their times, and yet they were men of their times, and this we too often forget. We can only fully understand them when we see them in their environmental setting, and herein lies the merit of Professor Smith's book. In it the prophets live in definite surroundings, amid very real problems, the attempted solution of which prompted all their deeds and words. In wonderfully clear, vivid language the long years of their history are unrolled before us. We follow the course of prophecy from its small beginnings in the "sons of the prophets", through its glorious rise in the eighth century, to its gradual absorption into the rising tide of apocalyptic in the post-exilic period. Like the prophets of other peoples the Hebrew prophets "began their course amid the mists of the low-lying valleys", but they did not remain there. They "carried on through these lower levels into the higher altitudes" of real religion.

Smith is a warm advocate of the modern interpretation of the prophets as mystics, but he has not made large use of the psychological approach, believing that its results are as yet too precarious for a handbook. His purpose is not so much to write a book of research as to interpret the assured results of modern scholarship; but he does not hesitate to follow his own preference when there is sharp difference of opinion. A commendable feature of the book is the many Biblical references, oftentimes accompanied by the text itself in the author's own translation. It is refreshing to have these translations because they are in every way superior to the accepted versions. For more information on various topics the reader is referred to the appropriate literature in the field. In the case of the cuneiform references, it is unfortunate that a book so antiquated as Harper's *Assyrian and Babylonian Literature* has to be the authority. *The Sacred Books and Early Literature of the East*, edited by C. F. Horne, offers much better translations, but unfortunately omits texts of importance.

Professor Smith is a reliable interpreter that one can follow with confidence. The reviewer notes with approval his interpretation of Isaiah, which rejects the anti-Assyrian and Messianic utterances traditionally attributed to him. This is fast coming to be the prevailing view and has much to support it. Some further light on a part of the

problem might have been gleaned from Sidney Smith's recent book, *Babylonian Historical Texts*, and reference should have been made to Fullerton's exhaustive article, "Viewpoints in the Discussion of Isaiah's Hopes for the Future", in the *Journal of Biblical Literature*, XLI. 1 ff. In the chapter on Ezekiel there should have been some reference to the recent onslaughts on the unity of the book. It is not certain but that changes must shortly be made in the interpretation of this book. Since the prophets had at least something to do with Deuteronomy, it is a little surprising to find no reference to it. Smith evidently felt that it lay outside his immediate field, but we should have welcomed his opinion on a book that is again so largely engaging the attention of critical schools. The proof-reading has been well done. The only error noted is on page 34, where the foot-notes should be reversed in order.

THEOPHILE J. MEEK.

BOOKS OF MEDIEVAL AND MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

Early History of the Christian Church from its Foundation to the End of the Fifth Century. By Monsignor LOUIS DUCHESNE. Volume III. *The Fifth Century.* English Translation by CLAUDE JENKINS, Professor of Ecclesiastical History in King's College, London. (London and New York: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1924. Pp. xiv, 555. 21 s.)

THE death of the Abbé Duchesne three years ago robbed the world of a mind possessed by the spirit of science, tireless in research, acute and genial in comprehension, endowed with the artist's instinct and power to express the result of the scholar's toil in a vision of imaginative realization. In his *Early History of the Church* the world is fortunate to have a rich deposit of superb learning that will long remain as an authoritative account of the momentous development of the Church in the ancient empire.

The third volume, admirably translated by Rev. Claude Jenkins, deals with the fifth century. Duchesne in a model preface prepares us for the period that will not excite enthusiasm: "a melancholy century, a century of ruin and tottering to a fall", the empire collapsing in the West, the Church in convulsion, crowded with members superficially Christian without real appropriation of the Christian ideal, an age of warlike theologians engaged in hot party strife, "men whose opinions are at bottom the same anathematizing each other for modes of expressing them", a century of leaders who though canonized as saints call for much indulgence from the historian, a period leaving us an enormous library of homily and controversy and of formal official records of councils occupied with theological battle.

Of all this material and of the modern studies that have been made of it Duchesne had full knowledge and critical control. In handling it

he was not in haste to reach a generalization of its meaning for our after time. He was historian. He must tell the story and tell it with exact circumstance of place and occasion and sequence of events, with due regard also to the characteristics of the actors in their personal relations to one another and their changing response to changing situations. He had the artist's necessity for individualizing characters, the dramatist's sense for the unfolding plot of events as a determining factor. An excellent example of this historical art is given in the chapter on Origenism and St. Jerome, a little drama where living, breathing men subject to the attractions and repulsions of human relations have their exits and their entrances, a little drama with consequences hardly foreseen for the subsequent life of the Church. The historian's major interest here was not in the doctrinal issue at stake. It was not the interest of a mind which subordinates all detail to that logic or law of historical happenings that will explain the evolution of the doctrinal system of Catholicism. Attention is fixed on the contingencies of human relations and situations through which any such law or logic finds its process, though the men involved are governed by the moment's exigency, without clear prevision of the ultimate outcome or aim. This chapter deals with an episode, but the management of it illustrates Duchesne's whole story of the melancholy century. By his patiently detailed investigation, his power of divination, his literary art, even obscure names in the records become living personalities of definite motive and bent, acting by their loyalty to groups and coteries and shifted in their actions by the shift of events. The world-wide drama involving all these bishops, monks, pietists, theologians, politicians, Eastern and Western, Greek, Roman, Barbarian, is brought into one great spectacle with just proportionings and subtle gradations. With Browning the reader may say, "I was never out of England—it's as if I saw it all".

A hideous century, said Kingsley in his *Hypatia*. A melancholy century, said Duchesne. He depicts the grim, sordid, cruel reality, but his temperament plays over the story with an ironical but benignant judgment of human natures and their lot. Kingsley was a polemic doctrinaire, Duchesne had a certain serene detachment from the war of militant theologians and political opportunists, the war for or against refined subtlety and formal precision of definition. He pauses at times to deplore the heavy price paid by religion for its theological form and often reminds himself and his readers of the original simple substance of religious experience underlying the contentions of the dogmatist. This is helpful indeed for a generation that needs to recover the vital germ hid in the husks of formal intellectual definitions, but it is not just the procedure and the attitude necessary for the comprehension of the historically inevitable process by which institutional form became fixed. But Duchesne's *forte* was not the history of dogma.

The non-Catholic will look to see how Duchesne measures the place of the see of Rome in this world situation. The non-Catholic historian would doubtless define this case more sharply by way of combating later extreme ecclesiastical claims typified by the bull *Unam sanctam ecclesiam*. Duchesne states the facts of the case with great delicacy and gentleness, indicating the incomplete realization in that age of what the Roman papacy claims and had then already begun to claim as its rights from the beginning. This gently considerate account is truer, after all, than the polemic of the adversary, being more sensible of the actual religious deference of that world for the see made peculiarly holy as founded by the two most glorious apostles and inheriting the religious prestige of the eternal city of Rome.

FRANCIS A. CHRISTIE.

Nordwesteuropas Verkehr, Handel, und Gewerbe im Frühen Mittelalter. Von PAUL KLETTLER. [Deutsche Kultur: Historische Reihe, edited by Professor Dr. Alfons Dopsch, II.] (Vienna: Oesterreichischer Schulbücherverlag. 1924. Pp. 238.)

THIS is the second volume in a series of works which are attempting to reevaluate the history of German material culture in the Middle Ages and are prepared under the direction of Professor Alfons Dopsch by his pupils. The field of study covers Saxon and lower Rhenish Germany, Flanders, Brabant, Holland, Northeastern France, and Anglo-Saxon England between the years 600-1000, which commercially are said to form "ein dichtes, engmaschiges Netz von Verkehrsadern mit zahlreichen Knotenpunkten" (p. 153, cf. pp. 38, 114). An elaborate map at the end of the book seeks to illustrate this statement.

One knows what sort of ideas to expect from the new Viennese school of economic history. Briefly put, the contentions in this book are: The commerce and material culture of Europe rapidly groped upward in the sixth and seventh centuries; Christo-Germanic culture quickly established articulation with Roman civilization, which for its own part was not so corrupt as usually supposed; from the time of the Carolingians onward commerce and trade, not merely local, but of an international nature, grew apace; the commercial enterprise of the Norse stimulated trade (which may be granted in part); the Arab sea power in the Mediterranean until the end of the eleventh century has been grossly exaggerated; city life was sturdy and active in the ninth and tenth centuries and commerce correspondingly prevalent—"so kann man schon vor 900 in mehrfacher Hinsicht mit Fug und Recht von *Handelsstädten* reden" (p. 107, cf. p. 10). "Besonders aber blühte das gewerbliche Leben in den Städten" (p. 143). This latter is said of the ninth century.

To sustain these astonishing theses Kletler sometimes strains his evidence to the breaking-point, sometimes makes significant omissions.

How thin the ice is upon which he often walks he himself unwittingly discloses by the qualifying adverbs which he frequently employs. For example, I have counted twenty-five instances of *wahrscheinlich*, twenty-four of *vielleicht*, seven of *natürlich*, and one *Wahrscheinlichkeit*. On page 46 *wahrscheinlich* occurs three times and *vielleicht* twice; on page 52 the former occurs once, the latter twice; on page 110 there is one of the former and two of the latter. The constant iteration of these concessives shows how weak the actual historical evidence is upon which Kletler bases his contentions.

Sweeping assertions are made, the evidence for which hangs by a hair. For example, the Frank conquest of Saxony by Charlemagne is declared to have been followed by an active trade development in lower Germany both with the old Frank land and with Anglo-Saxon England.—“eine selbstschaffende, aktive Bilanz” (p. 55); Rohrich the Norseman’s settlement in Frisia in 857 was due to the vision that astute sea-robber had of the commercial importance of the Low Countries, whereas the sole economic fact we know of him is that he complained because no wine could be raised there; manorial and monastery trade was active and intense in the eighth and ninth centuries—although, it is regretfully admitted, “wovon freilich die Quellen viel spärlicher berichten” (p. 59); the walled town was common in the ninth century with its Marktplatz (cf. pp. 100, 120, 143, 211); the commerce of London was so great as early as the tenth century that the city had a commissioner of the port (*Hafenvogt*, p. 106); transportation was so brisk that goods were carried “zu Wasser und zu Lande, auf Schiffen und Wagen” (p. 58); the volume and variety of Oriental imports was great long before the Crusades, and silk culture prevailed in Provence as early as the ninth century (p. 117); wholesale trade was already differentiated in the ninth century (p. 133).

Kletler’s method in handling evidence in order to extort these remarkable opinions therefrom may hardly be called scientific. For him every place is a walled town whether described as *castra*, *urbs*, *oppidum*, *arx*, or *civitas*, regardless of the fact that four of these words never mean a town in the feudal age, but a castle or citadel, or possibly a bourgade or moated grange; in like manner a palisade of stakes (*sepes*) is construed as wall (*murus*). Korvey’s market is a Messehandel, though the author would have difficulty in proving the statement. Kletler thinks that “vielleicht” the pilgrims to Rome and the Holy Land were greater dealers in spices and other Oriental luxuries of light weight and high value than the Syrians in the West were—Scheffer-Boichorst and Schulte exaggerate the economic significance of the Syrians (p. 219)—and adduces as proof that the deacon Gemulus brought four ounces of cinnamon, one pound of pepper, and one pound of incense with him from Rome to give to Boniface!

The author discreetly omits the evidence of coinage and numismatics from his pages. One wonders how he would attempt to reconcile this great volume and variety of commerce with a mere copper and silver currency, and often not even coins, but ingots. How, too, is the fact that in these centuries very many traders and artisans were also farmers and agricultural laborers to be reconciled with so much alleged commerce? If the new school of economic history established at Vienna continues to produce other studies written in the spirit and with the method of this work, there will come a time ere long when the subject will need to be defended from its enthusiastic friends.

JAMES WESTFALL THOMPSON.

A History of the University of Oxford. By Sir CHARLES EDWARD MALLET. Volume I. *The Mediaeval University and the Colleges founded in the Middle Ages.* Volume II. *The Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries.* (London and New York: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1924. Pp. xxiii, 448; xv, 502. 21 s. each.)

It is a somewhat remarkable fact that no one since Anthony Wood should hitherto have undertaken to write a critical history of the University of Oxford from its origin until his own day. Sir Henry Maxwell-Lyte's *History of the University of Oxford*, which was published in 1886, stops at the death of Wolsey, and the pages on Oxford in the late Dean Rashdall's memorable work only carry the story of its development to the middle of the fifteenth century. Of lesser literature there has indeed been a vast profusion—from the illustrated descriptions of the Oxford colleges, bought by American motorists as mementos of the brief "inspection" which certain guide-books assure them that the university will repay ("if pressed for time omit Cambridge") to the handy "guides" indispensable to Rhodes Scholars—but Sir Charles Mallet has been the first for over two centuries to attempt to tell the whole story in thorough and systematic fashion. If his third volume, which has not yet appeared, reaches the same standard that has been set by the two that lie before us—and there is every reason to believe that it will—he will have deserved the hearty thanks of scholars, of lovers of Oxford, and indeed of all who care for interesting and well-written books.

The merits of Sir Charles's work are many and conspicuous. Of the thoroughness and breadth of the knowledge that lies behind it there can be no question. He has gathered his material from many different sources, both in manuscript and in print; and he is the first historian to summarize and present in connected form the enormous mass of interesting information which has been accumulated in isolated fragments for years past by the Oxford Historical Society. The arrangements

and proportions of his book leave nothing to be desired. He has resisted the temptation to go deeply into the fascinating details of the history of the various colleges, and yet he has by no means ignored them; they are kept in proper subordination to the story of the development of the university as a whole. Moreover, he has contrived to keep his readers in close touch with the general course of English history in every period that he describes; one is made instinctively to feel what a vital influence the university has exercised in the life of the nation. The style is clear and pleasant. Some of the foot-notes are, perhaps, a little too long, and tend occasionally to wander rather far afield—as, for example, note 5 to page 81 of volume I., on the bibliography of St. Thomas Aquinas; but they are not so arranged as to cause annoying interruptions of the course of the narrative for the general reader, and they contain much for which the specialist will be profoundly grateful.

The first volume, which covers ground already traversed by Dean Rashdall and Sir Henry Maxwell-Lyte, contains less that is new than does the second. It recounts the origin of Oxford, its debt to Paris, the favor shown it by the first two Henries, and describes the medieval university at work and at play. One could have wished for a few pages more on the fourteenth-century disorders, the secession to Stamford, the riot of St. Scholastica's Day (February 10, 1355); the gap may be filled by consulting S. F. Hulton's too little known *Rixae Oxonienses* (Oxford, 1892). The origins and early development of the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth-century colleges are interestingly described, and Sir Charles shows an admirably judicial spirit in the verdict he passes on the rival claims of Balliol, Merton, and University to rank as the oldest in Oxford. "If the existence of a College dates from the establishment of its scholars by the bounty of their Founder in a common dwelling-place at Oxford, it seems that Balliol is entitled to precedence; for the House of Balliol Scholars undoubtedly existed in June 1266." If it "is to be dated from the promulgation of its Statutes, from the organization of a corporate society in the Founder's scheme", Merton may claim to be the first, in 1264. "Finally, if the existence of a College should be dated from the benefaction which supplied the funds appropriated later to its use, University College may trace back its origins to William of Durham, who died in 1249." The last three chapters tell the story of the origin of the University Library, of the benefactions of Duke Humphrey of Gloucester and Archbishop Chichele, of the activities of the so-called "Balliol Group", and of the advent of the New Learning; it closes with the unedifying tale of the university's surrender to the bullying of Henry VIII., when its opinion was demanded on the legality of the king's divorce.

It is hard to pick out the best part of volume II.; all of it is very good. College history occupies a less prominent place in it than in the first; the principal chapters deal with the changes in the university dur-

ing the period of the Reformation, the rebuilding (by the munificence of Sir Thomas Bodley) of the library and the schools, the new statutes and the chancellorship of Laud, the troubles and turmoils of the Great Rebellion, and the Oxford of the Restoration, where, despite all the efforts of disciplinarians like John Fell, a large portion of the scholars became "sots by authority". All the great events in the national life which were enacted within the university precincts—the burning of the Marian martyrs, the Oxford parliaments under Charles I. and Charles II., the expulsion of the fellows of Magdalen, and a host of others—are skillfully woven into the general course of the narrative; while the subtler influences—such as that of the circle of Lord Falkland at Great Tew—are depicted in charming phrases. The position of the university in the great religious controversies of the day is made abundantly clear. One sees not only why Oxford stood just where she did, but also why she could not possibly have stood anywhere else. But, after all, the history of any university is chiefly the history of the great men who compose it, and Oxford is no exception to the rule. It is in the lives of chancellors like Leicester, Laud, and Clarendon, of heads of houses like Prideaux, Sheldon, and Fell, and of characters like Anthony Wood that the heart of the story is really to be found, and Sir Charles has done wisely to group his facts about these and other great careers.

The two volumes are delightfully illustrated, largely by reproduction of the drawings made by order of John Bereblock, dean of Exeter, on the occasion of Queen Elizabeth's first visit to the university in 1566—the earliest drawings of the college which we possess—and of the sketches and plans of David Loggan who lived at the end of the seventeenth century. Lovers of Oxford will take pleasure in tracing the familiar outlines of the older roofs and spires and will call down blessings on the heads of those of the more modern Oxford architects who have followed the structural traditions of the several colleges with painstaking solicitude and reverence for the past.

ROGER B. MERRIMAN.

South Wales and the March, 1284-1415: a Social and Agrarian Study. By WILLIAM REES, M.A., D.Sc., Lecturer in History in the University College of South Wales, Cardiff. (London and New York: Oxford University Press. 1924. Pp. xvi, 303. 15 s.)

MR. REES's study is a continuation of the familiar investigations of Seebohm in his *Tribal System in Wales*, and of Vinogradoff in his *Growth of the Manor*. But whereas these other works were concerned chiefly with North Wales and with native Welsh institutions, Mr. Rees deals with South Wales and with its laws and customs as affected by the English-Norman conquest. Though he gives an introductory sur-

vey of pre-conquest conditions, his own investigations are mainly concerned with the period after the loss of Welsh independence, that is, after the annexation of Gwynedd and Deheubarth by the crown in 1284.

He reminds the reader at the outset of the general principle that political conquest often leaves economic conditions but little disturbed. And from one point of view his book is an attempt to show the continuity of Welsh economic and social institutions. Elements of feudalism, he points out, in the increasing power of the prince and the territorial lords were already weakening the kindred system before the Conquest. Under the foreign rule the earlier land divisions persisted, the new overlord simply replacing the old Welsh prince or chieftain. The Welshry of a given lordship continued to have their own courts and their own laws. The rulers, in their relations with the native population, were governed chiefly by economic rather than political motives, and the Welsh on their side resented not so much the alien rule as the alien maladministration. Herein, indeed, lay the most serious grievances which led to the revolt in the time of Owen Glendower. "The burden", Mr. Rees contends, "which Wales endeavored to throw off . . . was predominantly an economic one."

For this general principle, often urged in the present era of economic history, Mr. Rees's volume affords plenty of illustration and support. But its special value lies perhaps rather in the detailed description it gives of the actual conditions of life in fourteenth-century Wales. In the chapter entitled "The Castle" it shows very fully how the land was organized for purposes of administration, and traces the gradual encroachment of the royal power on that of the Lords of the March. In the chapter on the Manor it describes minutely the conditions of agricultural life—the construction and equipment of manor-houses, the system of land tenure and service, and the working of the manor, even to such practical details as the rotation of crops. Both the castle and the manor belong in the area of Norman influence in South Wales. But in many parts of the lordships, in what was known as the "Welshry" or *patria*, the old native economy was less disturbed, and in his third chapter, on the Welsh Lands, Mr. Rees describes this territory and the various stages of its growth from Welsh to English conditions. The final section of the book, on Pestilence and War, discusses the effects of the Black Death on the Welsh population and industries, and supplements previous studies of the subject by many precise statistics.

Throughout the work Mr. Rees makes full use of the published authorities as well as of his own extensive collections from unprinted records. The accuracy of his statements the present reviewer is not sufficiently familiar with the materials to undertake to control. But the book is thoroughly documented, and the author's discussion is judicious.

F. N. ROBINSON.

The Waning of the Middle Ages: a Study of the Forms of Life, Thought, and Art in France and the Netherlands in the XIVth and XVth Centuries. By J. HUIZINGA, Professor in the University of Leiden. (London: Edward Arnold and Company. 1924. Pp. viii, 328. 16s.)

THIS book consists of a series of studies on the ideals, habits of mind, points of view, "illusions, fancies, errors", of the Later Middle Ages, with special reference to the upper classes of France and the Netherlands. Their orders of chivalry, banquets, pageantry, love-making, funeral conventions, their religion, morals, philosophy, and what not, are examined and appraised. The work is one of mental and moral physiology and pathology, with the stress, it would seem, on the latter. "But for the history of civilization every delusion or opinion of an epoch has the value of an important fact" (p. 47). "And even political history itself, under penalty of neglecting actual facts, is bound to take illusions, vanities, follies, into account" (p. 82). The chief sources are found in literature, religious writings, and painting; the principal authors and artists laid under contribution are Pierre d'Ailly, Georges Chastellain, Eustache Deschamps, the Van Eycks, Froissart, Olivier de la Marche, Jean de Meun, Jean Molinet, Christine de Pisan, and Rogier van der Weyden. There are fourteen full-page illustrations.

The views and habits of the Franco-Burgundian aristocracy are discussed in twenty-three chapters, with a minor accompaniment of psychological or sociological "laws". Huizinga writes as if he knows just what it all means. The reviewer frequently prefers other interpretations. Take, for example, the title of the book. It is meant to signify that the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries in France and the Netherlands were "an epoch of fading and decay" (preface), "of decline and not of rejuvenation" (p. 253), although "at the same time and in the same sphere new things are being born" (p. 308). Or take the themes of the first two chapters, "The Violent Tenor of Life" and "Pessimism and the Ideal of the Sublime Life".

So violent and motley was life, that it bore the mixed smell of blood and roses. The men of that time always oscillate between the fear of hell and the most naïve joy, between cruelty and tenderness, between harsh asceticism and insane attachment to the delights of this world, between hatred and goodness, always running to extremes (p. 18). The passionate and violent soul of the age, always vacillating between tearful piety and frigid cruelty, between respect and insolence, between despondency and wantonness, could not dispense with the severest rules and the strictest formalism. All emotions required a rigid system of conventional forms, for without them passion and ferocity would have made havoc of life (p. 40).

This seems altogether too sweeping and sociological.

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXXI.—8.

The value of the book, however, does not depend upon its psychological-sociological *dicta*, which may be treated as *obiter*. The breadth of its scholarship, the riches of its matter, afford ample pabulum for historical enlightenment and rumination upon the variety and persistence of human traits. When Margaret of Anjou, wife of Henry VI. of England, was a fugitive, she went to mass one day and "had to ask a Scotch archer a penny for her offering, 'who reluctantly and with regret took a groat scots for her out of his purse and lent it her'" (p. 11). The extract from the *Jouvencel* on the joy of battle with your comrade at your side might have been written, as the author remarks, by a modern soldier. The quotation is said to exhibit "the primitive and spontaneous asceticism which is at the bottom of the chivalrous ideal" (pp. 64-65). The vivid combat between two burghers of Valenciennes, in 1455 (pp. 89-90), might be matched, I think, in some of our mountain rough-and-tumble fights. Chastellain, who describes it, is said to give "full rein to the instincts of natural cruelty" (p. 89). The medieval notion of equality is a commonplace of chivalrous literature. John Ball's text, from which he preached in 1381, was furnished by the nobility (p. 53). The sensual cynicism of the second part of the *Roman de la Rose* was a deliberate and popular defiance of the Christian ideal (pp. 100-106). Chapters XXI. and XXII., entitled Verbal and Plastic Expression Compared, show keen and novel analysis. "Words and images have a totally different aesthetic function." As soon as the thought which the poet expresses "is worn out and no longer responds to the preoccupations of the soul of the period, nothing of value is left to the poem except its form". "The painter of the same epoch and of the same mentality as the poet will have nothing to fear from time. For the inexpressible which he had put into his work will always be there as fresh as on the first day" (pp. 253-254). These excerpts indicate the range and quality of the book.

The last chapter, on the Advent of the New Form, is disappointing. The caption suggests Wölfflin, but it is not lived up to. Michelangelo's criticism of Flemish art for its lack of composition, quoted earlier on page 244, may be a criticism of the medieval spirit. But this lead is not followed in the concluding chapter. The advent of modern forms is not described nor explained; it is attributed to a growing grasp upon the spirit of antiquity through an inward ripening of the medieval mind (p. 307). This is evolution, to be sure, but without any medieval contribution. The position is not tenable.

The organization of the book seems a bit difficult. It is not a straight translation of the Dutch original, first published in 1919, but an adaptation, reduction, and consolidation, made by the translator under the author's directions (preface). Perhaps that explains the reviewer's difficulty.

G. C. SELLERY.

Konrad Peutingers Briefwechsel. Gesammelt, herausgegeben, und erläutert von Dr. ERICH KÖNIG, Professor der Geschichte an der Universität Tübingen. [Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Erforschung der Geschichte der Reformation und Gegenreformation, Humanisten-Briefe, I. Band.] (Munich: Oskar Beck. 1923. Pp. xv, 527. \$7.00.)

THIS volume, which grew out of Professor König's *Peutingerstudien*, published in 1914, gives us the extant letters to and from Peutinger which touch primarily upon his literary, artistic, and religious preoccupations. His professional and business correspondence is substantially excluded. Peutinger (1465-1547) was a hard-working city clerk of Augsburg until 1533, as well as legal and diplomatic adviser—he was a J.U.D. of Pavia, 1511—to other cities and princes. Thus, until he was approaching seventy, he had, broadly speaking, only his leisure hours to give to letters, in which he found his chief solace, next to his admirable wife, who was a Welser, and their ten children.

Of the 303 letters which make up the book, considerably more than half are in the original Latin; the others are in the original German. About three-fifths of them have been printed before, in whole or in part (preface). By a single count I find 165 written by Peutinger and 138 by his correspondents. These include notable persons, as Brant, Erasmus, Hutten, Maximilian, Pirckheimer, Reuchlin, Beatus Rhenanus; but most of the letters are from men not quite of the first rank. The most famous letters are one from Erasmus, dated November 9, 1520 (no. 206), advising with characteristic caution how the Lutheran problem should be handled at the Diet of Worms (previously printed by P. S. Allen in 1922) and one from Peutinger, dated May 23, 1521 (no. 212), reporting to the burgomaster of Augsburg on the appearances of Luther before the Diet (previously printed in large part in the *Deutsche Reichstagsakten*, 1896-1913). The best revelation of Peutinger's temper and scholarly interests shown in a single letter is, I think, to be found in his epistle to Beatus Rhenanus, dated October 24, 1536 (no. 293), written after his retirement from office (previously printed, with numerous errors, in *Briefwechsel des Beatus Rhenanus*, 1886).

The admirable analytical summary of Peutinger's activities which the editor furnishes in the index makes it unnecessary to do more than to say that Peutinger was an ardent student, writer, and promoter of the publication of works on both classical and German antiquities. He was interested in genealogies, geography, painting, sculpture, music, coins, and numismatic works. In 1540 he sent Pfalzgraf Ottheinrich ten silver coins of Roman consuls which he found not included in the Pfalzgraf's descriptive list, asking in return only a bit of wild game (no. 299). In 1516 he sent Maximilian, on his request, 137 names of classical ladies for the emperor's cannon (no. 167). His archaeological

flair comes out best in his very long (and, I fear, absurd) letter on the ownership of Modena (no. 280, pp. 446-458).

The shrewdness, the canniness of the man, appears in his medallion portrait (frontispiece). He is dubious about the reported find of the lost books of Pliny and Livy (1525); he has heard similar fables before (no. 257). He advises the heads of his city to be slow to enter the projected Rhenish league (1533) and reminds them that Emperor Frederick had induced the imperial cities to join him against Duke Ludwig and then had betrayed them and left them in the soup—*und lies die von Augspurg in der Suppen stecken* (p. 464).

Perhaps this same canniness helps to keep him faithful to the old Church. He disagrees with Augsburg's adoption of Protestantism and for that reason, in part, resigns his office; but he continues to give counsel to it (p. 470, note). He is a great and unwavering admirer of Erasmus. Here is a paragraph from his letter to Erasmus, December 9, 1521 (no. 220), which says much:

Ecce quid heri actum: Erat haec dies dominica Adventus Salvatoris nostri secunda. Ocio laxatus nomismatis nostris et Historiae augustalis Cornelii Taciti lectione me oblectabar. Sedebat prope, ab alia tamen tabula, coniunx nostra Margarita. Haec tuas Novi Testamenti interpretationes Latinas simul et eiusdem translationem Germanam, vetustam admodum nec plane eruditam, in manibus habebat. Mox me ab oblectamenti illis revocavit inquiens: "Lego Mathaeum capite 20. et perspicio Erasmus nostrum Mathaeo quicquam superaddidisse." Respondi: "Et quid?" Illa denuo: "At ille quae nec in Germana lingua habentur refert." Mox Evangelium Mathaei, quod idem Hieronymus commentatus, ad manum erat, ubi etiam verba illa "Et baptismo, quo baptisor, baptisabimini" non reperiiebantur. Ad tuas Annotationes cogebar; e quibus quam primum a te edocti ultra Marcum verba haec etiam in Mathaeo ab Origene et Chrisostomo atque Vulgario referri. Tum ipsa voluit, ut Origenes XII. et Chrisostomus LXVI. omilia super Mathaeum legeretur, ex quibus plane quae e Graeco restitueris cognovimus. Tibi spero non iniucundum fore te, praeceptorum amplissimum, non solum me, sed et coniugem in dies docere.

This collection of humanistic letters raises many questions which can not yet be answered with certainty. Were the Humanists, for example, with their high admiration for the past (*e.g.*, p. 433) and their regard for the old (*e.g.*, p. 487) as the foundation of the present, natural allies of the medieval Church? When we have many more such *Briefwechsel* we shall be in a position to answer such questions. For there is an intimacy, a casual revelation, about correspondence which exceeds that of formal books.

Konrad Peutingers Briefwechsel is a volume of admirable erudition and format. The preface, the indexes, the summaries which precede each letter, the explanatory foot-notes, the paper, margins, type, are a credit to König and to German scholarship and publication. Nothing but praise is due.

G. C. SELLERY.

Material for a History of Pope Alexander VI., his Relatives and his Time. By the Right Reverend Monsignor PETER DE ROO. In five volumes. (New York: Universal Knowledge Foundation. 1924. Pp. xlv, 613; xlix, 475; xxxvi, 566; xxxvii, 570; xxix, 398.)

THE colossal and painstaking industry expended on this confessed apotheosis of the second Borgia pope precludes its dismissal with the scant notice which such a work now deserves. Its publication under the title above is a tacit admission that its conclusions are of secondary consideration, that only the materials in it are of value. It is not intended that the reader confront these materials with an impassive eye. The five volumes—entitled respectively *The Family De Borgia, From the Cradle to the Throne, Pope Alexander VI. as a Supreme Pontiff, Pope Alexander VI. as a Temporal Prince, Alexander VI. and the Turks, his Death and Character*—are charged with the personality of the writer and teem with indignant denials of every aspersion to which a study of the evidence has ever led. The 224 documents distributed, a sheaf apiece, among the five volumes unquestionably illustrate a vast amount of diversified activity on the part of Alexander. Clearly his whole time was not spent in chambering and wantonness, and he certainly went through the form of legislating copiously upon subjects bearing on the spiritual interests of the Church. The documents are drawn in the great majority from the Archives of the Vatican and from other manuscript collections of Rome; but Paris, Munich, and Vienna are other great repositories which have been used. Those of Naples are necessary to a judgment on Alexander's connection with the French invasions of the kingdom of Naples, but were evidently untouched. As to printed works, the naïve admission (vol. II., p. xvi, note 43) somewhat clears the air, that "ordinary duties have not only retarded the publication of this our Work, but also prevented us from becoming acquainted, these last thirty years, with new writings on Pope Alexander VI." Accordingly it would be futile to look in the list of printed authorities (which, at the expense of needless repetition, usher in each volume) for such cardinal works as those of Woodward, or even Mathews or Sabatini, which bear directly on the subject, to say nothing of studies on Savonarola, as those of Schnitzer. Of the primary authorities, the Neapolitans have been neglected, such as Passaro and Notar Giacomo.

It is possible to appreciate Alexander adequately without making a medieval saint of him, but Monsignor de Roo enters the lists with the knightly object of unhorsing any who contend that Alexander was aught but a pattern of public and private morality; a devoted Italian patriot; a tireless upholder of the best traditions of the papacy; the friend of the weak against the strong; and the victim of systematic and

successful efforts to blacken his memory. It is not enough to acknowledge that he was not the stone of stumbling and rock of offense an earlier generation, nourished on Burckard and Infessura, believed him to be. The advocates of a human Borgia, to be distinguished only in degree from a Sixtus IV. or an Innocent VIII., must confess defeat no less than those who cling to the awfully fascinating picture of a Borgia stained with crimes mentionable and unmentionable, the dispenser of poisons and the paymaster of assassins. Cardinal Borgia was not, according to these volumes, a dissolute young cleric to whom Pius II. was already writing to be mindful of his cloth; he did not bring about his election by bribery or, if he did, it was not simony since the bull in condemnation of such elections dates from Julius II. and of course was not called forth by the election of 1492; he was not absorbed in the advancement of his family; his opposition to Savonarola was not political and personal; the divorce conceded to Louis XII. was not part of a bargain having to do with the career of Cesare; he was not the senile lover of Giulia Farnese. Some of these points still rest on the value to be attributed to contemporary authorities; and the author's simple criterion is to accept all that is favorable to Alexander and reject all that is not. Not everyone would disparage the evidence of Machiavelli or Nardi or Guicciardini or Zurita or Commynes when they fail to support his opinion; you can not discard all but the panegyrists and condemn the politicians out of hand.

All of the old stories which had been decently interred either dead or alive are here exhumed, though not for re-appraisal; but their tang is gone, and the arguments of 1880 lose in the telling now that a generation of scholars have succeeded in making us see the family against the background of its time. There is again dragged into the light the fantastic affirmation first made by Leonetti, that Lucrezia and her brothers were not the pope's children, except by a sort of adoption. They were the offspring of a nephew (lurking, it seems, in the genealogy compiled by Imhoff); were all born in Spain; and despatched by their widowed mother Vannozza to the protection of Cardinal Rodrigo at Rome, while she remained in Spain with a second husband (I. 130 ff.). It is necessary accordingly to see an arrant forgery in the bull of Sixtus IV. which confirms a gift of money to Pedro Luis (not Vannozza's son) and his brother Giovanni (Vannozza's son Juan) by Cardinal Rodrigo, whose children they are repeatedly said to be (I. 463-465). Only thus could De Roo, had he not disavowed any knowledge of works of this generation, have disposed of the bull of September 19, 1493 (Woodward in the *English Historical Review*, XXIII. 730 ff., 1908), which recognizes Cesare also as the pope's son. But De Roo also denounces as forgeries the famous Osuna documents which Pastor declared conclusive in the matter of a rehabilitation of Alexander and denounces them with no more reason than that lots of bulls were forged, and these must have

been, considering their purport. There is the question of Rodrigo's family name, though nobody minds admitting it may have been Borgia, and not Llançol (vol. I., ch. I.). There is the mysterious death of Prince Jem—"Zizim" is the name chosen for him out of the various alternatives (IV. 188-196)—and the unpleasant demise of the old pope himself (vol. V., ch. III.), with the stories to which they gave rise. Neither episode calls for the cry of poison which was early raised, though an able argument in favor of the story of Guicciardini about Cardinal Adrian's banquet is made by Portigliotti (*I Borgia*, Milan, 1921), based on the symptoms which have been taken to be those of malaria.

It is positively necessary to get away from a modern viewpoint. Machiavelli's failure to comment on Alexander's moral character is strong evidence to De Roo that there was nothing to provoke comment (V. 325)—as if moral shortcomings would occur to the author of the *Mandragola*. The cardinal's relations with Vannozza are disproved by the failure of Pasquino to display matutinal lampoons on the subject—as if public opinion demanded anything but circumspection for his public conduct from one in public office; Pope Pius had demanded no more of Rodrigo. De Roo takes very seriously the eulogies of the envoys from Italy as well as beyond the Alps sent to congratulate the new pope on his accession. Indeed Lord Acton thought the high-flown compliments more than conventional. But it must not be forgotten that the papal position had been immensely enhanced by the death of Lorenzo de' Medici and the discord between Milan and Naples just when the prospect of a French invasion loomed larger.

Alexander is not the negligible figure Gregorovius described—with "no impulse of greatness, nothing of regal ambition, nothing of indefatigable energy". Nor was he as exceptional a potentate as Creighton made him—one who played the game better than anyone else of the Italian princes and was consequently the object of their jealousy—"impetuous, eager, full of great designs", in contrast to Cesare, who was "cautious, keen-eyed and suspicious". He was really an opportunist, who made as much capital as he could out of events for which he was not responsible and who had his hand constantly forced, as soon as Cesare had grown to man's estate, by that restless genius. The question of his relation to the French invasions requires a distinction to be made between the first and the second. De Roo of course repulses the idea of any complicity of Alexander in what proved to be the delivery of Italy to the foreigner. He was certainly faithful to the alliance made with Alfonso II. at the time of the first invasion. His alliance with Louis XII. on the eve of the second is clear from the documents published by Pelissier in the Roman *Archivio di Storia Patria*, XVII. and XVIII. That Alexander acceded to the league between Louis and the republic of Venice is denied absolutely by De Roo (IV. 254-255).

In short, the author of the work before us here displays much the same qualities of perfervid partizanship and patient scrupulousness that he displayed in his *History of America before Columbus*, published in 1901, of which the reviewer understands this work to be an outgrowth. But if the earlier work was stimulating and suggestive, the present one in its imperturbability dams up interest at the source because, whatever be the material before us, it is not adapted to a work of edification.

There are no indexes, and the reader must be guided by tables of contents relieved not by dates, but by the windmills at which the author tilts. There is no literary style, but a fondness for curious or theological words, like "bilocation", "denigrate", "treague", "cruciata", "diriment", "brigue". There are frequent unidiomatic expressions and awkward slips in the use of proper names, as "Ferdinand and Elizabeth" (I. 197), Corinthia for Carinthia (V. 27), "Anna surnamed de Gandala" for Anne of Candale (III. 317), "Aloysius de Aragonia" for Luigi d'Aragona, who is moreover called count of Giraci instead of Gerace (IV. 105), the Lord di Libret for the Sire d'Albret (IV. 384), Çurita for Zurita, wherever the Aragonese historian is cited.

FREDERIC C. CHURCH.

Die Idee der Staatsräson in der Neueren Geschichte. Von FRIEDRICH MEINECKE. (Munich and Berlin: R. Oldenbourg. 1924. Pp. v, 545. Unbound, 10 M.; bound, 13 M.)

"REASON of state" is the familiar principle that the policy of a state must be determined by one predominant end—namely, the state's own well-being and progress. The book in hand—by one of the most distinguished of contemporary historians, editor of the *Historische Zeitschrift*—is a chronicle and criticism of that idea, principally as it has found written expression since the beginning of the sixteenth century, but supplemented by discussions of what rulers, ministers, and diplomats have done in their pursuit of ends of state. As a critical exposition of the views of the better known publicists—such as Machiavelli, Bodin, Richelieu, Grotius, Hobbes, Spinoza, Pufendorf, Frederick the Great, Hegel, the mid-nineteenth-century historians, and Treitschke—it gives us little that is informing or freshly illuminating. The significance of the book will probably be found in other features: in its inclusion of authors whose names rarely, if ever, appear in histories of political thought; and in its attempt to show in what measure and aspect the conception of reason of state embodies a permanent, legitimate, and inevitable principle of political action.

Of authors omitted in most theoretical histories but included in this work, some are not unimportant in the general intellectual history of Europe: for example, Boccalini, an Italian satirist of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century; Duke Henri de Rohan, celebrated Hugue-

not warrior, statesman, and author; Gabriel Naudé, physicist, critic, and famous librarian; Courtils de Sandras, French romancer of the early eighteenth century. The exposition also covers, in appropriately brief space, a number of obscure writers: some who in the sixteenth century spread Machiavellian doctrines through states of Germany and Italy; others, in France in the succeeding century, supporters or opponents of Richelieu. The author's own reactions to these views appear here and there in his historical review, but more amply in a concluding recapitulation. The important features of his appraisal are, on the one hand, an acknowledgment that the maintenance and enlargement of political power is a constant and indispensable motive of true statesmanship and, on the other hand, an attempt, rather vague, to establish criteria for the limitation and refinement of this universal political pursuit.

Particular maxims of reason of state, says the author, must vary, for they correspond to the structure and environment of the state in which that principle is applied. But one maxim is universal: it is that a state to be eminent or competent must be powerful and must be guided by strong, ambitious men. The primitive state came into existence through the propulsive force of an instinct for power. The most civilized state becomes ineffective for fulfilling its ultimate tasks if it fails to sustain its power. Moreover, the power impulse is characteristic not only of states but of statesmen also. Every statesman who has served his country well has been strong-willed, strongly nerved, personally enjoying power in itself, finding, in the cultivation of the strength and prestige of the state, an enhancement of his own personality. But the state does have ultimate moral and cultural ends to which its power should be subservient. The supreme tasks of the state are to vindicate individual right, protect the interests of lesser associations, and conserve and improve the cultural values of the nation.

States, says Meinecke, like individuals and lesser associations, have a two-sided character—"biologic", elemental, egoistic, and ethical, social. In all stages of political evolution the straining for greatness has inevitably something gross about it. Neither the statesman nor the populace can ever be entirely freed from elementary emotional impulses. Zest for largeness of power is ever in their blood. In the matter of territorial enlargement, for example, it is often beyond the capacity of either government or people to discriminate between what is imperatively needed for legitimate reasons of state and what is desired out of the mere joy of expansion. So reason of state is constantly in danger of degenerating into advantage of state or nationalistic egoism, which blends easily with advantage of the statesman, becoming a merely utilitarian motive, a Machiavellian technique for tyrants, without ethical implications. But the long trend of evolution is in the other direction. Political history reveals a general, though intermittent, ascent towards a world in which the more elemental forces fall slowly into the back-

ground and power is striven for less as an end in itself, more as an indispensable means to the spiritual well-being of the community. The zest for power tends to crystallize into noble forms. There is a pragmatic basis for this tendency. The successful statesman—although working zealously for the maintenance and enlargement of state power and inevitably stimulated in those efforts by conscious personal ambition as well as by a subconscious instinct for power—recognizes also that the comfort and happiness of his community is produced through the cultivation of ethical and legal values and that power itself is threatened through any persistent or radical distortion of such values. The existence of the whole structure of political authority depends upon the existence of a satisfied community, capable and willing to render political service, and upon an international condition of mutual good faith and good will. Blindly growing power destroys itself.

But Meinecke returns again and again to his admission that the state must at times disregard familiar norms of law and morality. By its very nature the state comes up against forces which drive it into violation of right. However much the moral sense of man protests, or however political sins may be clothed in legal and moral forms, the state must sin. This curse lies fatalistically upon it. German political thought and practice has not generally been more inclined than other countries towards adherence to this doctrine. Since the early nineteenth century there has been a general tendency to exaggerate this aspect of the dualistic character of the state; all the greater countries of Europe have pursued policies of narrow nationalistic egoism. Germany is not to be differentiated from others in this respect, except that she may have been more explicit as to her policy. "We are differentiated in thinking, but not in acting", from the rest of Europe; for Germans are less inclined to cloak their political practices in a moral ideology, less given to cant.

What the author seeks to demonstrate is that a dualistic conception of the state is essential for all effective political thought and action. The statesman must find some intermediate position between a blind apotheosis of *Machtpolitik*, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, a visionary political idealism and pacifism which admits no compromises between moral right and state necessity and attempts to place the state absolutely under the domain of law and morality. The author acknowledges that this intermediate position can never be indicated with any close approach to precision. Neither the historian nor the political philosopher can determine how far at any given moment in the life of a state free play must still be given to that love of power, desire to dominate, which has gradually elevated primitive man into the sort of life which history calls civilized, and how far, in the interests of civilization, such a motive must be restrained by considerations of right and law.

That seems a familiar and futile conclusion. So the value of the book lies simply in this: the author has authoritatively and adequately shown how generally and in what varying forms the principle of reason of state has been set forth by greater and lesser writers and statesmen, from Machiavelli to the immediate present.

F. W. COKER.

Hutten's Vagantenzeit und Untergang: der Geschichtliche Ulrich von Hutten und seine Umwelt. Von PAUL KALKOFF. (Weimar: Hermann Böhlaus Nachfolger. 1925. Pp. xii, 423. 12 M.)

THE good wine of Kalkoff's learning needs no bush of critical sign-painting to advertise it. Having for thirty years, with indefatigable zeal, devoted himself to the study of the ecclesiastical politics of the first lustrum of the German Reformation, Kalkoff is now on more intimate terms with the obscurest delegates in the Diet of Worms than most of us are with the members of our clubs, and he is as much at home in Louvain or Erfurt of four centuries ago as we are at Cornell or Harvard to-day. Not the least important of the many works in which he has clarified the picture of that time are those concerning Ulrich von Hutten, of which the second is now under review.

As a realist Kalkoff reacts strongly against the romantic and patriotic idealization of Hutten which began with Goethe, Herder, Kleist, and Wieland and which reached its climax in the biography of Hutten by D. F. Strauss (1871) and in the writings of Ulmann. To the critics of his results—in this connection see especially the articles of W. Kaegi in the *Historische Vierteljahrschrift*, XXII. (1924)—Kalkoff replies that he prefers the sober philological-critical method to "ingenious syntheses in which the phlegm of facts is so far sublimated that it can no longer spoil the results of idealistic historiography". His conclusions are extremely unfavorable to Hutten's character; and by painting him in the darkest colors the author throws an added ray of glory on the heads of his heroes, Erasmus and Luther. If Kalkoff is unfair to Hutten, it is not because he fails to prove that he practised many vices and committed many crimes, but that he fails to see that even this blackmailer and highway robber must have had some strange and inconsistent dash of nobility in his turbid soul, or he could neither have written "Ich hab's gewagt mit Sinnen", nor have felt the compulsion of a something greater than himself in the character of Erasmus and in the cause of Luther.

The author, after preliminary chapters on the development of the legends of Hutten and Sickingen, proceeds to show that his villain's "flight from the cloister", so romantically conceived by Strauss, was nothing but an abrupt departure with his friend Crotus and with a few valuable manuscripts stolen from Fulda. Following him in his tramp

through Europe, Kalkoff shows that his services to humanism and to the University of Mainz were of the smallest. There was, the author thinks, little opposition to the introduction of humanistic studies anywhere in Germany, and the resistance of scholasticism to humanism he believes to have been greatly exaggerated by later historians.

When he comes to the climax of Hutten's career in the ill-starred rebellion of the knights, Kalkoff shows that the leaders were actuated by nothing but unbridled greed and that they had no plan but to exterminate the clergy, or at least to demolish the edifice of the Church's power in a general *Pfaffenkrieg*. If they appealed to the "Gospel", they had not the faintest conception of the Reformers' programme, nor the slightest countenance from them. Indeed, Kalkoff shows with great probability that Luther's *True Warning to all Christians to keep from Tumult and Rebellion* was directed not, as has hitherto been believed, against the Wittenberg radicals but against Hutten's plans for a general rising. Luther had read his sanguinary manifesto and must have had him in mind when he characterized the unnamed conspirator as "ein stolzer, frecher, freveler Mensch"; and he probably attributed to Hutten the *Neu-Karsthans*, as many persons have done since, though Kalkoff shows that it was really written by Bucer.

In an interesting digression the author discusses the image of Hutten reflected in Erasmus's Colloquy *Γάμος Ἀγάμος*. To the reviewer it seems that "Quicksnatcher", the protagonist of this little drama, first published in 1528, five years after Hutten's death, was a composite portrait of Hutten, Eppendorf, and Thomas Brun of Basle. There is, perhaps, a clearer allusion to Hutten in the Colloquy *The Soldier and the Carthusian*, first printed in 1523.

PRESERVED SMITH.

La France et Rome pendant les Guerres de Religion. Par FÉLIX ROCQUAIN. (Paris: Édouard Champion. 1924. Pp. xx, 554. 35 fr.)

THE author of this book which was finished in 1914 is now ninety-two years of age. Since 1874 he has published nine important volumes on history and has contributed articles on topics related to history or education to more than a dozen of the leading reviews of France. His last volumes form a series. In 1881 he published *La Papauté au Moyen Age*, in 1893, 1895, 1897, the three volumes of *La Cour de Rome et l'Esprit de Réforme avant Luther*. The publication of the present work was suspended by the war for ten years.

The work is solidly based on primary sources, mainly printed; for there are only some thirty citations from archives and, unless the reviewer's memory is at fault, a number of them have been printed. With the judgment of a trained historian, M. Rocquain "without neglecting

memoirs has preferred to base his work on the correspondence of the personages who have taken in this drama the leading rôles. Thus we have been able to understand better the feelings of the actors in it and the cause of its events". He has handled these sources with candor and justice, giving a lucid outline of the troubled history of France during the terrible years from 1559 to 1598, showing at each step the attitude of the papacy toward the situation. He points out that it is an error "to believe that the question of religion always determined the struggle against the Protestants". He sees in the League a device "to mask ambition and hide greed", and he shows that some of the leaders of the Reformed were more than once willing to defend their liberty at the cost of loss to France. He sees in "Henry of Navarre, the future Henry IV., a prince whose soul remained above party and who never considered anything but France"—an opinion to which, in that absolute form, the reviewer is unable to subscribe entirely.

To the serene and judicial atmosphere of the work there is one small exception. There is a tone of special pleading in the handling of the attitude of Gregory XIII. toward St. Bartholomew which does not compare well with the handling of the same topic by Lord Acton. That the pope was an accomplice before the fact is of course entirely untrue. No one except the little council which planned that sudden crime was an accomplice before the fact; but, if Gregory XIII. continued to believe in the Huguenot conspiracy which was alleged as its cause, he was about the only person with inside sources of information who did. The letter from the nuncio quoted Catherine's falsehood that the massacre was a long planned crime and the Cardinal of Lorraine at Rome emphasized that lie and caused it to be elaborated in a pamphlet.

These are, however, small matters in a very solid work, a worthy crown to the four volumes on the papacy which preceded it.

One looks in vain for an alphabetical list of works cited, and it is a great pity that so valuable a book is not made more usable by an index.

PAUL VAN DYKE.

Les Brigandages Maritimes de l'Angleterre. Par MARC DE GERMINY.

Tomes I.-III. (Paris; Édouard Champion. 1925. Pp. xxii, 326; 235; 315.)

It has occurred to the author of this work that it would be desirable to compile and depict a complete history of English maritime atrocities and outrages against the law of nations on the seas. He has done this, with vivid descriptions and comments, from such documentary evidence as can be found in the French naval archives. The three volumes are written with an avowed chauvinistic motive and a sprightly, sardonic style. "If the present work falls under the eyes of British readers," observes the author in his preface, "they will judge it written with

partiality, let us say more, with passion. . . . But if there are Englishmen who write for the English there are also Frenchmen writing for the French."

Here is the principal weakness of the book. It begins and ends with a motive. The appalling list of piracies, sedulously collected and related in warm, idiomatic French, is designed to prove that France must have a big navy to protect herself against such treatment in the future. The British are excoriated as unredeemable pirates, notwithstanding the Declaration of Paris and the Hague Conventions by which Great Britain has long since given up privateering, Rule of 1756, paper blockades, war without declaration, capture of scientific expeditions, and disregard for the rights of neutrals. M. Marc de Germigny's record, in fact, stops with the close of the Napoleonic wars. He does not mention a single piracy after that time.

Full of "asides" and "editorial" remarks, the narrative constantly pauses to take flings at events and principles which arouse the indignation of the author without being necessarily germane to his historical task. Such are what he regards as the hateful naval armament limitations agreement of the recent Washington Conference, the ingratitude which the United States has shown for French assistance and friendship during the eighteenth century, the uselessness of the Bourbon Family Alliance, and the weakness of the Spanish navy as an allied fleet. These are only a few of such digressions. Nothing reminds the reader that the author is conscious of the fact that the British navy and American troops saved France not so long ago. There is no reflection on the maritime policy of Germany during the last war. The loose moralizing is barbed only for the English. When the writer stops his narrative to indulge in such reflections, the reviewer, were there space or inclination, might be permitted to reply in kind. But with the historical task of compiling a complete account of English piracies we can have no quarrel. There might be pleasanter researches and more beneficent, but that is for the particular investigator to decide. The historian can not resent his choice. All he can do is to ask whether the work is accurate and supported by the principles of historical criticism.

Here the author's prefatory remarks immediately put us on our guard. A history, of any kind, whether of piracies or pieties, written particularly "for Frenchmen", or "for Englishmen" or for Americans, ought to be anathema to the conscientious historian. Mistrust is increased when the evidence comes almost exclusively from the archives of the French marine. Vigilant students no longer accept unquestionably a narrative of international events, in diplomacy or war or in that highly modern subject, the history of atrocities, when it is drawn from one set of archives. *Ex parte* evidence of this nature, no matter how eloquently or indignantly presented, would not be accepted to-day in any international court of justice with-

out giving the accused a chance to reply from his own or neutral archives. Much less will the historian take it.

If history written with a declared motive and from one set of archives is *prima facie* unreliable, it becomes the more suspect when studded with egregious errors as to ordinary well-known events. For example, the author finds it relevant to his subject to repeat what Paul L. Ford long ago demonstrated as a "clumsy Tory forgery"—the utterly worthless falsehood concerning Washington's alleged mistress, Mary Connor. This episode is repeated as sober truth just because the author saw it in print in that preposterously grotesque publication *Anecdotes Anglaises et Américaines*, published during the War of 1812 as a miscellaneous collection of old wives' tales and hearsays about America. Equally fantastic is the statement that the United States now owes France over two billions of dollars, principal and arrears of interest on the Revolutionary war debt! As to this, *vide* Wharton and *American State Papers*, not Paris journalists of the year 1924. Quite mistaken also is the statement that President Wilson seized upon the *Lusitania* incident to declare war on Germany.

Heaven knows that the British Admiralty has never been ladylike. They have long charges to face before the bar of history. American readers do not have to be reminded of British piracies. There were the years 1803-1815. But American readers, and indeed French readers familiar with the matchless studies of Henri Doniol, Paul Fauchille, and, just recently, Bernard Faÿ, will regard M. Marc de Germiny's work as at most an indictment, with the other party still to be heard from. It shows much more enthusiasm and verve of style than it does of historical criticism and balanced judgment. The book can be used by the historian only with the greatest discrimination.

SAMUEL FLAGG BEMIS.

London Life in the XVIIIth Century. By M. DOROTHY GEORGE (Mrs. ERIC GEORGE). (London: Kegan Paul; New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 1925. Pp. xi, 452. 21 s.)

LITERARY skill and historical scholarship, ably blended, make the reading of this volume a delight. Social history is extremely difficult to write; the sources are scattered and fragmentary, the subject-matter diffuse and unorientated. Mrs. George has surmounted these obstacles. She has not only made good use of the better known historical material for this period and subject, such as the Place MSS. and the writings of the brothers Fielding; she has also read deeply in the *Guild Hall Sessions Papers* and in the *Bills of Mortality* (published records of the London parish clerks), gleaning from such certain sources of local information many fresh and little known facts.

The book is a comparative survey of life among the poorer folk of the metropolis. It deals with the statistics of birth, mortality, disease,

crime, and labor; it tells about housing conditions, immigration and emigration, parish children, apprentices, theatres, imprisonment for debt, public houses, amusements, state lotteries, and Fleet marriages. It portrays a society rougher and more brutalized than that of the present but at the same time one in which a gradual improvement was noticeable.

The cruder kinds of crime were less in evidence at the end of the century than at its commencement. The death rate had diminished, houses were better constructed, streets were less filthy, disease less rampant. The London hospitals lost fewer and fewer patients. Dispensaries spread broadcast the simpler rules of hygiene. Scarlet fever and small-pox were not nearly as destructive of life, and by 1804 it was reported that typhus had virtually disappeared.

Life for the poor continued hard. Ill-constructed houses were frequently collapsing upon poor tenants, killing many. Whole families lived in cellars. To avoid paying the window tax, windows were constantly bricked up; and this illogical tax was made still more burdensome in 1798 by including all houses which contained six or more windows. From the country districts flocked thousands of casual workers. Bricklaying, a fluctuating employment, was carried on largely by the Irish. They underbid the English workmen, lived on a low economic scale, and insisted on the pig in the home. Hours of labor ran from six in the morning to eight in the evening. Even those engaged in the physically exhaustive trades worked twelve hours. The decorative craftsmen received decent pay, but wage-sweating seemed to rule in the majority of occupations. The consumption of liquor in London was enormous. Punch clubs and drinking clubs were supported by all classes and the "garnish" or initiation treat was universally customary. Many workingmen received their pay in ale-houses, and the exceeding low cost of gin made drunkenness the more prevalent. Methodism seems to have been a restraining influence, offset possibly by the incentive to further drinking created by Sunday blue laws.

Mrs. George enters very fully into the ways of life of the London apprentices and parish children, thereby paralleling somewhat the books of J. L. and Barbara Hammond. She likewise, in an appendix, has given us copious notes from contemporary sources illustrative of her main narrative. Her account is exhaustive and, to the reviewer, is subject perhaps to but two adverse criticisms. The title of the book is somewhat misleading, since it is only life among the poor that she depicts. In the second place, is it not possible that even life among the poor was more pleasant than one would gather from this book? The police and hospital records, which Mrs. George combs so well, inevitably cast a dark shadow. The writings of contemporary reformers do likewise. The social historian would do well to be somewhat more alert, possibly, than Mrs. George to this general truth.

WALTER P. HALL.

China and Europe: Intellectual and Artistic Contacts in the Eighteenth Century. By ADOLF REICHWEIN. Translated by J. C. POWELL. [The History of Civilization, edited by C. K. OGDEN.] (New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 1925. Pp. vii, 174. \$5.00.)

IN these latter days we have had many books and articles describing the effect of Occidental culture upon China, but few of us have been aware that the influence has to some extent been reciprocal. This volume is witness to two periods of Chinese influence upon the Occident. In the first place the incentive to write it has come from the recent deep interest of many Germans in Chinese thought, especially in the *Tao Teh Ching*. The dissatisfaction with civilization, the advocacy of a return to the way of nature and an abandonment of all the artificial restraints of a highly organized culture, the attitude of passivity, and the mysticism that are characteristic of that famous classic, appear to have made a powerful appeal to many members of the "youth movements". To those who have lost faith in present European culture this ancient Chinese philosophy seems to offer a way of escape. So great has been the interest that eight translations of the *Tao Teh Ching* into German have appeared in the present century. All this we learn from the introduction.

The main body of the book is given over to a description of the influence of China upon Europe in the eighteenth century. The subject is not a new one, for it has already been discussed in several books in French and German, including especially Söderblom's *Das Werden des Gottesglaubens*. So far as the reviewer is aware, however, nothing of importance on the subject has previously appeared in English, and on the Continent no writer has gone into the topic as extensively as has the author in the present volume. In the Europe of the eighteenth century, so Mr. Reichwein informs us, China was idealized and for more than two generations art and thought showed the result. The greatest of the Jesuit missionaries to China were appreciative of the better elements of the culture of the land of their adoption and in extensive writings made known in Europe the results of their observations and studies. Their books and articles revealed a new world which to many who were dissatisfied with existing conditions appeared ideal. The resulting influence was most marked in the realm of art. Indeed, rococo style was in large part patterned after Chinese models. True porcelain was for the first time produced in Europe. Faience with Chinese designs was popular. Lacquer, Chinese architecture, including the roof and the pagoda, Chinese colors, and the Chinese style of painting were popular. Incense, tea, silk, and sedan chairs were the vogue, and, by a process of evolution, in an attempt to copy China, there were produced the first wall papers. Many of the great minds of the "Enlightenment", so the author tells us, thought that they saw in China a society in which the principles

that they advocated had been successfully put into practice. Voltaire especially was impressed with what he knew of the country. Leibniz, too, was much interested. Only the writings of the Confucian school had been translated and Rousseau found them so contrary to his own social philosophy that he was bitterly anti-Chinese. The author might well have added that had Rousseau become acquainted with the *Tao Teh Ching* his attitude would probably have been quite different. The Physiocrats thought that they saw in China an example of the success of their theories and often quoted that country in support of their contentions. The author concludes his specific examples of Chinese influence by recording two rather different phases of it: the attempt to copy nature in gardening—the “English garden”—owed much to China, and Goethe in later life became an admirer of the country. In none of the instances cited by the author except in some phases of rococo art and manners, does the example of China seem to have been the inciting cause of a movement in Europe. It simply reinforced existing tendencies.

The author has done his work well. He supports his contentions with ample evidence and does not permit himself to be unduly influenced by his evident admiration for China. The translator has performed a real service in making the volume available to the English reading public.

K. S. LATOURETTE.

Die Grosse Politik der Europäischen Kabinette, 1871-1914: Sammlungen der Diplomatischen Akten des Auswärtigen Amtes . . . herausgegeben von JOHANNES LEPSIUS, ALBRECHT MENDELSSOHN BARTHOLDY, und FRIEDRICH THIMME. Volumes XIII. to XVIII. (XIV. and XVIII. in two parts.) (Berlin: Deutsche Verlagsgesellschaft für Politik und Geschichte. 1924. Pp. 342; 675; 561; 491; 594; 936.)

THE abundant flow of secret documents from the German archives continues to pour richly forth, having reached the year 1907 with volume XXV. The six volumes here under review cover Germany's foreign policy—and largely that of other countries also—from 1897 to 1903. In Anglo-German relations this was the momentous period from the darkening sky in South Africa and the increase of the German navy to the eve of the Anglo-French Entente; in the Near East the “frozen condition” from the Austro-Russian partition of interests to the Münzsteg Programme; in the Far East from the rapid penetration of China by the European powers, with the consequent Boxer Rebellion, to the eve of the Russo-Japanese War. In all these fields the German documents again reveal innumerable new and interesting details.

In 1897 Germany regarded her relations with her neighbors as fairly satisfactory. With France the Kaiser desired a rapprochement, but this was persistently refused; improved relations between the two countries

were furthered, however, by various acts of courtesy on both sides, and by the settlement of Togoland boundaries (XIII. 91-109). As to Russia, the letters between "Willy" and "Nicky" were unusually frequent and friendly. Aside from newspaper recriminations, and the constant friction and suspicion due to the fact that Russia and Germany belonged to two hostile systems of alliance, the good relations between the two countries were ruffled by nothing of greater magnitude than German restriction upon the importation of Russian geese. Toward England the feeling of the German Foreign Office was one of irritation at England's great colonial possessions and at England's seeming unwillingness to help or allow Germany to secure more of a share of the unappropriated parts of the world. Germany felt helpless in colonial expansion, because she had no navy to speak of; it was not so much that she wanted a navy with which to dispute British sea power in a naval war, as to have a convenient asset in diplomatic argument. As the Kaiser wrote ruefully to Hohenlohe in October, 1896 (XIII. 4):

England could at any moment take from us our colonies, and we should be totally unable to prevent it. We could not wage war, because our fleet is nothing but a handful of peas against England. It would be an easy way of boxing our ears and so discrediting us in the eyes of the world. . . . It simply gives new evidence how foolish it was to embark on a colonial policy ten years ago without having a navy.

The Boer War (XV. 365-561; XVII. 183-237), and the bitter press campaigns in Germany and England which accompanied it, did much to estrange the peoples of the two nations facing each other across the North Sea. But the two governments so studiously sought to avoid trouble that the Boer War never caused dangerous friction between Downing Street and the Wilhelmstrasse, even after the English arrest of a German steamer bound for Delagoa Bay. Even before the Boer War, the German Foreign Office realized that the struggle would be a hopeless one for the Boers and tried to avert hostilities; it warned Krüger through Dutch channels that he would not have German support and had better make timely concessions to Chamberlain's demands (XV. 369 ff., 381-385). When the Boers disregarded the hint, declared war, and invaded British territory, the Kaiser burst into a marginal note of joy at Britain's discomfiture: ". . . The fun will be worth seeing! John Bull is not accustomed to this! I hope that the English may get into a regular pickle, and that India, Asia, and Abyssinia will join the dance!" (XV. 405.) This *Schadenfreude* is hardly consistent with the unctuous letters of sympathy and the sophomoric "aphorisms" on the proper conduct of the war which he sent to Uncle Bertie and Grandmamma (XV. 553-561). They do not suggest sincerity of character toward his English relatives. However, whatever may have been the Kaiser's personal feelings and deficiencies of character, these new documents indicate that throughout the whole South African War his official attitude and that of the German

Foreign Office was perfectly "correct". He and Bülow knew that they had no navy to enforce respect from England for any efforts on behalf of the Boers. It has often been asserted that Germany tried to induce France and Russia to join with her in intervention in favor of the Boers. The fact is that the real authors of this project were France and Russia, and they have falsely sought to throw the odium of it on Germany, just as did England in a similar case in regard to Cuba on the eve of the Spanish-American War (XV. 22-30). Germany refused to participate with France and Russia in any such South African intervention, partly because England would have regarded it as unfriendly and primarily because France would not accept as a preliminary condition a mutual guaranty of territory, *i.e.*, an acceptance of the Alsace-Lorraine settlement of 1871 as final and definite (*cf.* XV. 406 ff., 515-542).

In view of later developments perhaps the most important feature of Germany's foreign policy during this period was her failure to meet more cordially the feelers for a rapprochement or alliance which England thrice put forth. Eckardstein has already told us much about this, but it is clear from these new documents that his statements are not wholly reliable and need to be corrected at many points. The reasons for Germany's failure to seize the proffered hand were various: resentment at England's seeming niggardliness in colonial matters, and Holstein's conviction that England would always come forward again and bid higher; the fear of antagonizing Russia; the Kaiser's dislike of England; and, not least, the idea of the German Foreign Office, and especially of Holstein, that Germany enjoyed a strong and enviable position of independence in holding the balance of power between England on the one hand and Franco-Russian interests on the other. By this independence Germany could gain more than by tying her hands in an alliance with England. Holstein was convinced that England and France would never join hands, certainly never England and Russia. Not until the fall of 1903, when it was too late, did Germany begin to realize that Morocco and Egypt might bridge the gulf of centuries of Anglo-French hostility.

The pages devoted to the Hague Peace Conference (XV. 139-346 and *passim*) are always interesting and often amusing. The Tsar's, or rather Muraviev's, proposal came upon the chanceries of Europe more like a bomb than a dove of peace. French and English, as well as German, ministers were shocked and dismayed at the Tsar's "frivolity", "stupidity", "naïveté", and "pure nonsense", no less than at what they believed to be Muraviev's vanity, deceit, and instability. Apparently Russia's own ally was so surprised and upset that Muraviev had to make a special trip to Paris to win Delcassé's support. Even Russia's own representatives were in many cases skeptical or antagonistic. Count Staal, the Russian ultimately picked to preside at the conference, was forced by his official position to speak in favor of proposals to which at heart he was opposed. Count Witte's derogatory remarks in his memoirs later,

echoed in Dillon's *Eclipse of Russia*, that the proposal for a peace conference was "verbiage", "a piece of hypocrisy and guile", "a ruse by which we could get Austria to stay her hand and discuss armaments instead of investing in a new gun", have been much quoted by cynics and others. These later expressions are perhaps warped by Witte's subsequent irritating experience of the Tsar's fickle optimism and fatal feebleness. At the time the conference was first broached Witte doubted whether it could achieve any practical results, but said he personally favored it as a helpful restraint on influential Russians who were urging rash adventures in Turkey and the Far East. Though denying that the Tsar's proposal for the reduction of armaments was in any way due to the exhaustion of Russian finance, he did say it was folly for the Continental powers to spend such vast sums on armies, when what they all really needed was the upbuilding of navies to keep England and the United States in check.

After the diplomatists of the Great Powers had recovered from their first shock, they all sought to restrict the scope of the conference as much as possible without incurring the odium of seeming to sabotage the Tsar's well-meant intentions. Nothing sums up dozens of despatches on this topic better than Delcassé's confidences to the German ambassador in Paris:

Our interests in regard to the conference are exactly the same as yours. You do not want to limit your power of defense at this moment nor enter upon disarmament proposals; we are in exactly the same position. We both want to spare the Tsar and find a formula for side-stepping this question, but not let ourselves in for anything which would weaken our respective powers of defense. To prevent a complete fiasco, we might possibly make some concessions in regard to arbitration, but these must in no way limit the complete independence of the Great Powers. Besides the Tsar, we must also spare the public opinion of Europe, since this has been aroused by the senseless step of the Russians (XV. 186).

In these passages the cynic and pessimist may find much to his taste. But it is significant of the progress which the movement for peace and the limitation of armaments has made during the last twenty-five years that proposals which formerly caused stupefaction, wrath, or hilarity are now discussed on every hand by responsible ministers and even given realization in international agreements.

To Americans these volumes are of special interest because they register significantly the advent of the United States as a world power. The documents in the previous volumes have touched but meagrely on American relations. With the Spanish-American War, however, Washington assumed real importance in the eyes of Germany and of Europe.

SIDNEY B. FAY.

Life of Robert Marquis of Salisbury. By his Daughter, Lady GWENDOLEN CECIL. Volume I., 1830-1868; Volume II., 1868-1880. (London: Hodder and Stoughton; New York: George H. Doran Company. 1921.¹ Pp. viii, 353; vi, 390. 21 s. for each volume.)

LADY GWENDOLEN CECIL's life of her father is one of the most important contributions of recent years to the history of British politics, and must be set in a class apart, along with Morley's *Life of Gladstone*, Fitzmaurice's *Life of Earl Granville*, and the fifth and sixth volumes of Buckle's *Life of Disraeli*. That verdict is offered even although her two volumes bring the history down only to 1878. The relation of the authoress to her subject, combined with her gift of firm and free discussion of political issues, at once differentiates the biography from those well-intentioned failures which the ordinary academic or literary mind produces and calls "lives". Here a living distinctive person moves and speaks. It is not unusual for sons and daughters to attain what may be called subjective success in writing of personalities known to them through most intimate intercourse; but it is the objective value of this picture which is so impressive—as though the figure remembered had banished biased and partial feelings and had mirrored itself with simple unemotional truthfulness.

It is difficult, within the limits of a review, to do full justice, both to this gift for characterization, and to the interest of the purely political chapters. But no estimate is just which does not acknowledge the writer's power in revealing the growth of an original and impressive character from solitary and valetudinarian youth to a maturity, intolerant, independent, singularly honest, and essentially manly. It is apparent from a score of terse criticisms that the daughter has inherited something of the father's frankness; as for example, when, discussing his controversial powers, she adds: "It is improbable that those who differed from him in any fundamental sense were ever influenced to a change of view by his writings or speeches. He certainly did not deserve that they should be so, for he never made an effort to convert them." Her chapter entitled "Religion" especially deserves notice—surely surprising to those who expected to find dogmatic and insular High-Church Anglicanism, and to whom there is presented, in the words he himself used of Gladstone, a great Christian man, but one whose faith was founded on as profound a skepticism as Newman's own, and dominated by as comprehensive a fatalism as that of John Calvin. These pages are in their own way a notable contribution to the history of the varieties of religious experience.

Success in characterization has not been purchased by any weakness in narrative or political analysis.

¹ The *Review* waited awhile for the issue of the completing volumes. Ed.

The least adequate section is that which deals with Lord Salisbury's work between 1874 and 1878 in the India Office. The reason for that seems to be that these years marked a violent change from the policy of masterly inactivity on the Northwest frontier, which John Lawrence and all the stable intellects concerned with the government of India had founded, to the spirited folly of Beaconsfield, and of Lytton, the viceroy whom he had chosen for his freedom from sobering experience and his willingness to do something for "the glory of the empire". At heart and in methods one of the older school, Salisbury appears here as hardly master in his own house, and ought not to be burdened with all the blame for a short but unhappy period in Anglo-Indian frontier history. For one piece of good advice he must receive full credit. "I think you listen too much to the soldiers", he told Lytton in June, 1877. "No lesson seems to be so deeply inculcated by the experience of life as that you should never trust experts. If you believe the doctors, nothing is wholesome; if you believe the theologians, nothing is innocent; if you believe the soldiers, nothing is safe. They all require to have their strong wine diluted by a very large admixture of insipid common sense."

On two vital chapters in nineteenth-century British history the book makes important contributions to our knowledge—the Reform agitation of 1866–1867, and that phase of the Eastern Question which prevailed between 1875 and 1878. In answer to a possible criticism that too much space has been devoted to an ancient parliamentary squabble, it must be claimed that, for Lady Gwendolen, the Reform Act of 1867 marks a crisis in the history of her father and the old Tory party. It was not a storm in the parliamentary tea-cup; it was a battle between constitutionalists trained in the school of Burke and modern democracy represented, in this case, by Disraeli as well as by John Bright. In the biography no attempt is made to soften the rigor of Lord Cranborne's (as he then was) reactionary views. He was fighting for a position more coherent than that of the friends of progress, and almost as defensible. He worshipped liberty as it had been handed down to him in the form of traditional British constitutionalism. He recognized the democratic view as the enemy, and fought it beyond the last ditch. By a happy combination of correspondence, speeches, and extracts from *Quarterly* articles, his daughter presents the forcible and credible picture of an actual honest Tory—almost the last of them—fighting inevitable change with insight, negative but undeniable, and belaboring his recreant chief as well as his opponents with the most refreshing pungency of phrase. The chapters on these events are a necessary correction of Mr. Buckle's fourth volume; they can not be ignored in any further estimate of Disraeli's character. It is useful to remember, in days when the brilliant foresight of Disraeli's reform is generally admitted, that a very honest gentleman who served with him in that Cabinet could tell Sir Stafford Northcote that "he had

the greatest respect for every member of the government save one—but that he did not think his honour safe in the hands of that one”.

The second volume is almost wholly occupied with the Eastern Question, in what, till 1914, seemed its most grandiose form. Here again the biography is complementary to Mr. Buckle's sixth volume, and ought gravely to modify the prevalent verdict on Beaconsfield's statesmanship. It is clear from Lady Gwendolen's chapters that Lord Salisbury did not share his chief's pro-Turkish views. Down till 1878 he never identified himself with Beaconsfield's policy; indeed apparently at the Constantinople conference in December, 1876, his chances of making a pacific settlement seem to have been wrecked by the Turkish conviction that the views of the envoy were not those of the British premier. He co-operated with Beaconsfield only when a definitely European crisis had come into existence, with Turkey as a mere occasion of strife, when he thought that a resolute assertion of British claims was necessary to check the grave advance of Russia. The freshest pages in the second volume are those which give his estimates of European statesmen interviewed by him on his way to Constantinople in 1876, and those frank and humorous notes to his wife from Berlin, which make us regret the happy meeting which brought the correspondence to an end. Beaconsfield never said anything more Disraelian, even in his novels, than when, as Salisbury tells, he broke out, over the timidity of his Cabinet at home: "They are all middle-class men, and I have always observed through life that middle-class men are afraid of responsibility." There are references too—and credible references—which show that Salisbury had he pleased might have done for Beaconsfield at Berlin what Mr. Keynes did for Clemenceau and Wilson and Lloyd George at Versailles—shown the pathetic mixture of glory and foolishness in the chief figure at the congress. "He [Beaconsfield]", he writes to his wife, "is not exactly false, but he has such a perfect disregard for facts that it is almost impossible for him to run true"; and again, "what with deafness, ignorance of French, and Bismarck's extraordinary mode of speech, Beaconsfield has the dimmest idea of what is going on—understands everything crossways—and imagines a perpetual conspiracy". There were really two conferences, as the biography clearly shows, the essential conversations with Russia, Austria, and Bismarck before the envoys met; and that comic stage—with tragic possibilities—when Bismarck sat as honest broker, and Gortchakov made his last swagger in diplomacy, and Beaconsfield, who all his life had found it difficult not to treat himself as the hero of one of his own fantastic novels, thought that at last truth was showing herself more glorious even than fancy, and brought home Peace with Honor. His junior, whose sardonic honesty allowed to himself as little mercy as it did to others, in retrospect declared that he never wished his foreign policy to be judged by his action in 1878—"I was only picking up the china which Derby

had broken". Memories of August, 1914, may lead some to question the success, even of that humble task.

Lady Gwendolen Cecil's volumes, then, present to the general reader the unforgettable portrait of a great Englishman; to the historian they furnish material for the revision of political judgments; in all her readers they must breed a most flattering impatience for their successors.

J. L. MORISON.

The Neuroses of the Nations. By C. E. PLAYNE. (London: George Allen and Unwin. 1925. Pp. 468. 16 s.)

THE immediate purpose of this volume is to investigate the psychic conditions of the nations before the World War, to show that the great catastrophe was the result of mental and moral derangement in the mass-minds of the belligerent nations. Its ultimate aim or objective is to help build up a preventive psychiatry which may in the future be of service in averting a similar conflagration.

The author uses the results of the new science of social psychology, accepting the conception of the crowd-mind as a collective mentality. She believes that group-mentality is subject to derangement and that mass-hysteria, mob-madness, and group-neuroses existed in a more or less acute form in Europe for many years prior to 1914, but especially after 1889.

The causes for the morbid conditions of the group-minds in Europe were many and various. Among them were the belief in the descent of man from animals, with its exaltation of the animal side of man's nature; uncertainty concerning the future, especially among the working-classes, who were often face to face with unemployment; the irritating sense of failure and frustration which followed the ill-success of attempts at rational and benevolent settlement of quarrels and rivalries between competing nations; the highly stressed and complicated conditions of existence; in Germany especially, certain repressions, as the suppression of the federal character of the Empire; inability to intervene in behalf of the Boers, a suppression which undoubtedly started much of the irritation and misunderstanding between England and Germany. Combined with these are two other fundamental causes, the mental turmoil and tempest of feeling resulting from Bismarck's dismissal and from the attempts to suppress the socialists.

In other countries, too, men's nervous systems failed to adjust themselves to the ever-increasing strain of life, though the neuroses of France were more acute than those of any country except Germany. The result was a general nervous breakdown, with nervous excitement, depression, general irritation, uncontrollable emotion, manias, fears, passions, an inhibition of reason and intelligence. From this morbid and overwrought condition of the mass-minds resulted the war.

After examining the causes of the neuroses, the author describes their symptoms and character, shows their influence on the social life, art, literature, history, and politics of the time, and traces their centre to certain nationalist and chauvinist groups, whose ideas affected the mentality of entire peoples, producing throughout Europe a common atmosphere of tension and dread.

Her conclusions are based on evidence drawn from historical narratives and sources of many kinds originating in the thirty years before the World War. She has relied especially on writers who are sensitive to the nature and movements of group-minds and to the prevailing mental atmosphere.

The volume is a unique, distinguished, valuable, and unbiassed contribution to the voluminous literature on the causes of the Great War. While many journalists, publicists, and authors have touched on the mental conditions prevailing in Europe before the war, no one has hitherto made an analytical study of European group-psychology setting forth the factors which shaped it, its character and content, and its relation to the war.

E. E. SPERRY.

The Naval History of the World War: the Stress of Sea Power, 1915-1916. By THOMAS G. FROTHINGHAM, Captain U. S. R. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press; London: Oxford University Press. 1925. Pp. xi, 342. \$3.75.)

THIS work, though published independently, is the second volume of Captain Frothingham's *Naval History of the World War*, and covers the important period from the declaration of the "War Zone" by Germany in February, 1915, to the decision of the German emperor for unrestricted U-boat warfare in January, 1917. It includes the beginning of the virtual blockade of Germany and of the U-boat activities, with the loss of the *Lusitania*, the definite Allied failure at the Dardanelles, the overwhelming of Serbia, the ultimatum of the United States to Germany, the entrance of Italy into the war, and, finally, the battle of Jutland and its military and political consequences. While many books of first importance have been written about the World War, Captain Frothingham is the first historian to be in command of sufficient source-material to compile an independent history, for on the one hand the volumes hitherto published have been mere narratives of personal experiences or on the other apologies for the authors, who were in most cases active and responsible participants in the events they describe. The present author has the enormous advantage of perspective, which enables him to perceive and to point out the really vital elements in the complicated problem, and this he has done boldly and excellently. His narrative is a merciless exposition of the attempt of two mighty partizans to solve a task the magnitude of which neither recognized and for which neither was prepared.

It is a fascinating tragedy. In it appear the two great leaders, Kitchener and the Grand Duke Nicholas, who, satisfied with initial success, failed to see that "far greater tasks and utterly different conditions would be encountered in 1915". To offset this was the "artificial German strategy of 1914, which had thrown away the initial military superiority of the Germans", as well as the German prepossession that the "dry land" campaign would decide the war. There were divided counsels and hesitating action on both sides, significantly illustrated by the pet idea of Lord Fisher, to land a Russian army in Pomerania under cover of specially designed British ships, although, during the spring of 1915, "when Lord Fisher was still jealously fostering the building program for this project, the Russian armies were being thrown back in defeat all along their front". Captain Frothingham quotes with approval Lord Sydenham's dictum concerning the harmful influence of this Baltic invasion, that "the effects of this diversion of the energies of the Admiralty staff from naval to military objects cannot be estimated". "It was in the Baltic that the Germans had most feared harassing naval attacks by the British", but "the Germans were left practically free to use the Baltic for undisturbed transportation of minerals and supplies from Sweden. And, being thus undisturbed by British naval offensives, the Germans were enabled to develop the offensive use of their own U-boats", etc. The author lays stress upon an element which had a seriously depressing and laming effect upon British naval strategy, namely, the constant fear of an attempted landing of German forces in England, which was the source of the defensive policy that characterized the British naval leaders from now on. Sir Julian Corbett, the British naval historian, said of this period: "The spectre of invasion had again arisen, as it always had done when our arms were unsuccessful abroad. . . . So deep, indeed, was the apprehension in military circles, that they began to express discontent with the naval dispositions in the North Sea, and to press the Admiralty to take further precautions." Even after the battle of Jutland Admiral Jellicoe wrote, of a German naval threat in August, 1915: "In the possible alternative of the movement being designed to cover a landing, the Fleet would also be favorably placed to prevent such an operation." That this invasion-prepossession should be entertained by even some of the leading naval authorities seems incredible, but the fact is that they were apparently thinking more of the harm which might be done them than the harm they might do to the enemy. This idea is clearly seen in the narrative of Admiral Jellicoe (*The Grand Fleet, 1914-1916*), which gives the British commander's policies and the reasons for his movements and which, as Captain Frothingham rightly says, must be carefully studied if one is to do justice to the admiral or to understand what happened at Jutland, the great naval battle, the description of which, together with the resultant military and political situations, forms the theme of a third of the present volume. The dominating thought in the

British commander's mind is expressed in the following words: "The last [a third] consideration present in my mind was the danger involved in leaving too much to chance in a Fleet action, because our Fleet was the one and only factor that was vital to the existence of the Empire, as indeed to the Allied cause."

It is evident that this "last ditch" idea of Admiral Jellicoe's quite obliterated from his mind the fact that the German naval forces were greatly inferior to his own and that therefore his opponent was obliged to keep the defensive more in mind than he. No naval leader in Great Britain appeared to realize the fact that the smashing of the German fleet would go a long way toward ending the war in a short time and, as the event proved, when the British commander actually held the Germans in his power, and lay between them and their base with a bigger and a faster fleet, this Jellicoe Cunctator let his enemy slip through his hands, as Fabius had Hannibal, and the war went on for four miserable years longer.

It is plain that our author awards the tactical victory at Jutland to the Germans and is not even willing to grant the British a strategical success, which they claimed on account of keeping their fleet intact. In this he seems to have the approval of Lord Sydenham, who says, "In our long and glorious naval history nothing directly comparable with this tragedy stands recorded"; and it is probable that all the best naval authorities must agree with this grim verdict.

Tactically, though both sides erred, the British were by far the greater offenders, and the list of their errors is long, most of them springing directly from the overcautiousness of the commander-in-chief. In the first place, although the British intelligence service was in general better than the German, Admiral Jellicoe was in possession of no information giving him even an inkling of the extent of the German intentions on the thirty-first of May, nor was Admiral Beatty much better served; so that the concentration of the British forces was slow and imperfect. At all events Beatty, perhaps feeling that his six battle-cruisers were superior to the five under Hipper, joined battle when he was out of supporting distance from the powerful Fifth Battle Squadron under Evan-Thomas, the help of whose 15-inch guns would have quickly put the German advance force to rout; with the result that, so deadly was the German fire, in a few minutes the *Indefatigable* was sent to the bottom and the *Lion* seriously damaged, whereupon Beatty had to open the range, in other words, to turn away from the enemy. Then, when Beatty once more closed with the German battle-cruisers, the supporting Fifth Battle Squadron was still unable to overcome Beatty's lead, and the second clash with Hipper saw the second great cruiser, the *Queen Mary*, disappear beneath the waves "in clouds of gray smoke". Significant of the stupefying excitement of the action are Beatty's words in his report, "It would appear that at this time we passed through a screen of enemy submarines".

As a matter of fact there were no German submarines present. Meanwhile Hipper had succeeded in drawing Beatty towards the German battle fleet, the sight of which by Admiral Beatty is called by Sir Julian Corbett "a startling development, scarcely credible". Beatty immediately steamed north to join the on-coming British main force, but the subsequent concentration was confused and delayed, which is understandable from Admiral Jellicoe's words: "When contact actually took place, it was found that the positions given were at least twelve miles in error compared with the *Iron Duke's* reckoning." It was inevitable, from the perplexingly confused accounts of the many movements of this battle by the British commanders, that no clear conception of it was possible before the publication of the narratives of the German leaders, notably that of Admiral von Scheer, which make plain many things. The contrast between the two commanders-in-chief is marked: on the one hand Jellicoe, with his tendency to overestimate the enemy's forces and to underrate his own offensive powers, thus failing thereby to grasp a magnificent opportunity, and on the other Scheer, bold, crafty, and resourceful, who, though he was actually at one time in the potential power of a swifter and more powerful adversary, "turned and twisted" himself out of the alarming situation in a manner which can only be called uncanny. It is probable that naval historians will eventually accord Admiral von Scheer a very high place among maritime commanders. His opponent at Jutland has placed on record his admiration for German ships, German fire, and German discipline, and his praise was justified. Tactically the most astounding feature of the battle was that three times during the action, and in the actual presence of the enemy, the Germans executed a right-about "swing-around" of all ships engaged, which turned the line and brought the ships into an opposite course. This manœuvre, previously pronounced unreasonably hazardous by the British, had been carefully practised by the German admiral, who was now beholden to it for the safety of his fleet. Hidden by smoke-screens and unexpected by the enemy, this evolution was baffling in the extreme. The first "swing-around" was made as Hipper joined Scheer after leading the unsuspecting Beatty into danger and resulted in the whole German fleet pursuing the British advance guard northwards. The second was the most extraordinary evolution of its kind in naval annals. Finding himself to westward of the whole British force, and separated by it from his base, Admiral Scheer, though with a weaker and slower fleet, led it "straight into the centre of the arc formed by the British fleet". The German commander does not tell us clearly what was in his mind, but it is probable that his confidence in his own gunnery and manœuvring power led him to take the chance of either breaking through the British centre, where he would not be expected, or of executing again his favorite "swing-around". The British fire proving too hot, he made his second turn-away to the westward in astonishingly efficient fashion, its success being

assured by the fact that the British fleet was actually made to sheer off from an attack by German destroyers, the spectacle being presented of a stronger force retiring before a weaker one. According to Captain Frothingham, if Jellicoe, instead of turning away, had immediately closed with his enemy, a British victory of decisive character would have been inevitable. As it was, since Jellicoe was determined not to fight a night action, the last real opportunity to engage the weaker enemy effectively by daylight passed, and Scheer escaped again to westward, where, however, he was still cut off from his base by the British fleet. The rest of the daylight of the thirty-first was wasted in futile concentration, and the ensuing five hours of darkness witnessed a most confusing and disheartening game at "blindman's buff", the salient feature of which was the steaming south of Jellicoe's whole line for "some eighty-five miles", as Jellicoe said, "to remain between the enemy and his bases". This was a correct decision, but what happened was that Admiral von Scheer simply waited until his foe was far away to the south and then quietly crossed his wake and anchored safely at his own base! As a matter of fact, the German admiral, no doubt sensing the repugnance of the British to night actions, had determined to fight his way through the enemy's fleet in the dark, if necessary. But his kind opponent spared him that trouble.

What our author calls "the tragic failure of the British to gain a decision in the one great naval battle of the World War" becomes clearly that, when one considers that the Germans had no reserve behind their High Seas Fleet. Its destruction would have meant the opening of the Baltic, the stopping of Scandinavian supplies, the possibly complete hindrance of the development of the U-boats, besides the immense and inevitable moral effect. On the other hand the result was a great heartening of the German Empire, the quick development of the U-boats, a serious loss of prestige to the British navy, the continued complete control by the Germans of the Baltic, and a favorable impression upon neutrals from the Teutonic standpoint. "The German strangle-hold upon Russia remained unbroken, and it was impossible to get supplies through the Baltic to the Russians, to avert the exhaustion that was leading to collapse and revolution." Finally, the result of the British "defensive" policy was that it induced the Germans to adopt unrestricted U-boat warfare. In view of these considerations the British view, that Jutland had the effect of a victory, is untenable.

Captain Frothingham's volume is supplied with numerous small but clear diagrammatic maps and an appendix.

EDWARD BRECK.

Recent Developments in International Law. By JAMES WILFORD GARNER, Ph.D., LL.D., Professor of Political Science in the University of Illinois. [Tagore Law Lectures, 1922.] (Calcutta: University of Calcutta; London and New York: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1925. Pp. xiii, 840. Rs. 17 in India; 30 s. elsewhere.)

THE Senate of the University of Calcutta in 1921 honored Professor Garner by electing him to the Tagore Professorship of Law for 1922 and asked him to take as his theme "The Development of International Law during the Twentieth Century". He accepted but got leave to extend the period dealt with, though his main attention was to be directed to events since 1900. The lectures were given in November and December, 1922, and, substantially as originally written, were published in 1925.

Dr. Garner regarded international law as "the culmination of historical and evolutionary processes" which "can be satisfactorily studied only by beginning with their origins". Therefore he sought "to trace and evaluate some of the more important developments which have attained their present state since" 1900, but he dealt also with the actual interpretation and application of the law and there he sometimes found, not progress, but retrogression.

The late developments seemed to him to consist less in the formulation of new law than in its extension to new relationships, "the adaptation of old rules to new conditions" and agreements on rules to end divergence. This latter process, he says, "involved codification in the larger sense" and this he esteems the most substantial progress achieved. There went with this, he says, "the development of agencies and processes for the peaceable settlement of international controversies" and "the effort to give the Family of Nations" a legal organization, "with common administrative, legislative, and judicial organs", which he finds, in part, realized in the League of Nations.

He accounts for the preponderance of the Laws of War in his lectures by the fact that during the past half-century developments have been largely in that branch and the laws of peace have been more static.

His lectures were fifteen in number and their titles show their scope. The first four dealt with Recent and Present Tendencies of International Law, Conventional Development, the Hague Conventions, the Declaration of London, and the Development of the Rules of Aerial War. The next four dealt with the Interpretation and Application of International Law in Recent Wars. The next two discussed Treaties of Peace and the Progress of International Arbitration. Three lectures followed on the Development of other Agencies for Peaceable Settlement, International Legislation, and the Organization of the International Court of Justice. The fourteenth lecture records the progress of Codification, and the final lecture, in a lucid retrospect, reviews the whole and discusses the Reconstruction of International Law.

Charles James Fox, instructing Sir Samuel Romilly for a great debate, told him it was better his hearers should note some repetition than that they should fail to comprehend. On this ground we may justify the considerable duplication observed in the latter lectures, especially in an instructive course. Notwithstanding, this reviewer has read them to the last page with great pleasure, appreciation, and much instruction.

Professor Garner has written in a free narrative style, exhibiting cause and effect, in a generous and modern spirit, with admirable temper and vast and minute acquaintance, especially with recent and contemporary authorities and discussions. His notes are copious and comprehensive, including not only English and American but French, German, and Italian citations. His views are never revolutionary or extreme. If they err at all, it is on the side of docility. He constantly considers what is practicable as well as ideal, and he can differ without denouncing.

He finds abundance of greed and folly in the international struggle, but he traces and exhibits a vast network of beneficent treaties and conventions, at first bipartizan, later multi-partizan, and finally world-wide, tending to organize and co-ordinate all nations for peace and co-operative administration. They deal with a thousand useful activities from the distribution of the mails to the restraints of contagion and vice, the protection of patents and copyrights, the checking of the opium traffic and "white slavery" to the hiving and disseminating of useful knowledge, and, everywhere, the protection of the weak and the restraint of the predatory strong.

He shows that, so far from the Great War having destroyed international law, it was fought to redress its breach and assert its authority, and that the nation which particularly flouted and derided its modern tendencies and the sovereign who thought his petty will and ambition above its salutary restraints met only defeat, dismemberment, dethronement, and disaster. He quotes Sir Thomas Barclay's pregnant saying that "to say that international law is dead is about as true as to say that an inundation or an earthquake puts an end to engineering or architecture".

He recognizes that the old rules limiting the hardships of war to armed participants must fall when, as now, all participate; that under modern conditions of manufacture and transport substantially all articles of commerce are contraband; that close investment in blockade, being now impossible, is no longer required. He admits the necessity of bringing ships to port for search, but advocates certificates of "no contraband" by belligerent consuls as adequate to pass a neutral ship unsearched. The tendency wastefully to destroy prizes he would check by allowing their sequestration in neutral ports pending adjudication, and he cites the Grotius Society of England in support of this relaxation. He would further restrict the repairs and supplies got by belligerent war-ships in neutral ports and views complacently their total exclusion as practised by

the Netherlands, Norway, and Sweden during the Great War. Placing mines outside the territorial waters of the belligerents he denounces and calls for restraints far more stringent than those of the Hague.

He favors international codification but justly deems it a long labor, fit for an international commission.

The League of Nations, he thinks, does not approximate an ideal organization, being, as yet, "rudimentary and resting mainly on moral authority", "but it represents", he says, "a beginning and a very promising beginning and we must trust to time and circumstance to develop and perfect it". He regards it as a transitory stage through which the world must pass in order to attain an effective organization, like the confederation which preceded our Union. He says "that the doctrine that states are bound by no law except their own is a malign and sinister inheritance of the middle ages" and should be discarded. He recognizes the beneficent primacy of the Great Powers, cites many authorities against the equality of nations, and defends the representation, in the League, of India and the dominions of Great Britain. The opposite doctrine might have been difficult to maintain at the University of Calcutta.

He evidently deplores the lack of compulsory jurisdiction in the International Court, but finds its system much less objectionable than that of the Hague tribunal.

The fact that only moral sanctions enforce its decrees seems to him not serious in view of the scrupulous respect accorded arbitral awards. He finds it not strictly the judicial organ of the League since it functions independently. Our own Supreme Court, it must be observed, does the same but is universally considered the chief judicial organ of our government. If submarines are retained as vessels of combat he would confine them mainly to attacks on vessels of war or merchant ships armed for offense.

Space is too limited to epitomize more, though much remains.

In his closing chapter Dr. Garner says,

With increasing solidarity of interest and consequent interdependence of states the principle laid down by President Wilson that "neutrality is no longer feasible or desirable when the peace of the world and the freedom of the people is involved" will tend more and more to become a principle of international conduct. More and more there will be a shifting of emphasis from the rights of states to duties, from individual to collective responsibility, from national sovereignty to international control, from independence to interdependence and, ultimately, the relations of states will tend to become less and less international and more and more super-national.

This has been fully discerned by the opponents of the League and is, of course, a main ground of their hostility. They are unwilling to exchange all that they have and value for "ills they know not of".

Where so much is found of merit it is a matter of regret that typographical errors are so abundant. The printing was done in India, and the distance precluded the reading of the proof by the learned author. It is also deplored that so much important matter should be so meagrely, unsystematically, and imperfectly indexed. There is no table of cases or citations and a work, otherwise so available for reference, is thus too largely sealed from use.

CHARLES NOBLE GREGORY.

BOOKS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

The Newspaper and the Historian. By LUCY MAYNARD SALMON.
(New York: Oxford University Press, American Branch. 1923.
Pp. xliii, 566. \$7.50.)

The Newspaper and Authority. By LUCY MAYNARD SALMON.
(New York: Oxford University Press, American Branch. 1923.
Pp. xxviii, 505. \$7.50.)

THOUGH Miss Salmon's two volumes have a luxurious appearance, they will be among the necessary books in every well-appointed library. They are compendious in the amount and range of material which they include, but the author offers to the reader a thread of sound critical observation all the labyrinthine way along with an excellent table of contents and helpful notes. The volume which naturally will be of especial interest to historians is that which bears the title: *The Newspaper and the Historian*. Its aim is to answer the questions as to what grounds for confidence in the newspapers can be given the student in reconstructing the past; what tests can be applied which will enable him "to separate the wheat from the chaff"; what principles can be deduced in general for guidance in discerning the truth and detecting falsehood and what guaranties can be given that will absolve him from the necessity of testing the accuracy of every statement made? To answer these questions, and others of similar import, Miss Salmon has made what is probably the most thoroughgoing analysis of newspaper values that has ever been undertaken.

In the first place, the personality of the newspaper to which the historian goes should be understood, for, elusive as personality is, it is the characteristics which enter into it that often determine in large measure the reliability of a given newspaper. Personality is disclosed not only by the newspaper's expressed beliefs and opinions but also by the emphasis that is given, over a considerable period, to certain kinds of news. To an acquaintance with the newspaper's personality, the historian is therefore first of all commended by the author. Through chapters devoted to the human machinery for the collection and distribution of news; to the general reporter (whose misspelling of the Christian name of the prominent citizen thrown from his automobile at 2:30 A.M. should be for-

given, if history, with a thousand years' leisure at her disposal, can not find out just who set up a new throne or pulled down an old one); the special correspondent (a "fine fellow" who is often not responsible for the limitations that hamper his work); the war correspondent (the first of whose gallant gild was Julius Caesar); the editor and the editorial (which becomes more valuable for the use of the historian as it becomes more and more impersonal); and the advertisement (which true or false is an "invaluable record" in the reconstruction of the normal life of the past), she arrives at a summarizing chapter on the authoritativeness of the press and reaches the conclusion that for the study of normal life the newspaper with all its limitations, its inaccuracies, its unworthy representations, its lack of proportion, its many temptations to throw prismatic colors instead of the white light of truth on the accounts of the day, still remains the most important single source the historian has at his command for the reconstruction of the life of the past three centuries.

The other volume, entirely independent of the first, entitled *The Newspaper and Authority*, has to do primarily, not with the authoritativeness of the press, but with the varying attitudes of authority toward the press: with censorship, both preventive and punitive; with regulation of the press; with problems introduced by the foreign-language press and the vernacular press; with the freedom of the press; and with propaganda. All these have a bearing upon the authoritativeness of the newspaper for the historian, which is his chief concern perhaps; but their discussion in itself should be of interest and of profit to the general reader as well. One significant statement which rises in the midst of the discussion and out of the wealth of illustration is to the effect that since the function of the press is to give the news, authority is fundamentally antagonistic to it, for authority is opposed to whatever is new. In this position authority is supported by human society, which is also opposed to innovation. Often the complaint is made that the press does not give the news or suppresses it. "But", says Miss Salmon, "it may at least be questioned whether the public really wishes to know the news, since it, too, 'feels the pain of a new idea'". It is this eternal conflict between the two principles of authority and research that is "the despair of the historian". This volume has to do largely with the incidents in that conflict—a conflict which has lasted for three centuries and will be settled, she predicts, only when the press asserts its right to true freedom and claims it from authority. It is, thus, to be inferred that the freedom of the press lies only within the keeping of the press itself.

As to the influence of the press, about which there is a most discerning and readable chapter, there is this comprehensive paragraph of comfort and hope:

But because some papers are wholly unauthoritative, because others are in the main reliable but are in other respects defective, because all are in a vein tainted with original sin, it does not follow that the his-

torian must abandon all use of the press in his work. A deaf man may compose symphonies, a cripple plan a bridge, a man with a withered arm may win the race, and a blind man may be an expert weaver. The press as a whole may rise superior to its limitations and, like the historian, wrest victory from defeat.

The newspaper and the historian will both be in lasting debt to Miss Salmon, who has spoken as one with authority.

The Town Proprietors of the New England Colonies: a Study of their Development, Organization, Activities, and Controversies, 1620-1770. By ROY HIDEKICHI AKAGI. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania. 1924. Pp. xiii, 348. Distributed by D. Appleton and Company, New York. \$3.00.)

HERETOFORE the student of New England history, when puzzled by the difficulties of towns and town proprietors, has been obliged to resort to various local histories in order to discover the nature and significance of the recurrent troubles. From a paragraph here and a chapter there he was able to assemble an impression of general conditions, but nowhere could he find a satisfactory comprehensive account. This deficiency no longer exists. Dr. Akagi has made a conscientious and intelligent study of a vast number of local histories, town records, and proprietors' records, including many manuscripts, and from a mass of detail has evolved an intelligible view of the system under which New England towns came into being and grew to maturity.

By pointing out the marked difference between the hardworking, resident proprietors of the seventeenth century and the speculating, absentee proprietors of the eighteenth, he throws much light upon the land problems of both centuries. His attitude towards both types of proprietors is fair. He is equally sympathetic with the non-proprietors who invariably came to resent their exclusion from the common and undivided lands. The reader sees both sides of the question and is likely to be impressed with the magnanimity of the proprietors. With the law clearly on their side they chose more often to conciliate than to stand upon their rights. In spite of the many controversies one feels that these well-to-do New Englanders of the colonial period were reasonable human beings who valued good-will even more than pounds and shillings. This is a novel conception for some of us, but the facts given by Dr. Akagi sustain it.

The speculative proprietors of the eighteenth century were a less earnest type. They represent an interesting step in the economic progress of New England. One does not feel the same amount of respect for them as for their serious-minded predecessors, but one can not help liking them. England's wave of speculation reached the American shore at a favorable time. More or less capital had accumulated in the sea-coast towns in the seventeenth century. The prospect of doubling it by in-

vestment in land in the interior became suddenly alluring. Why not risk a little money in procuring a grant, spend a bit more—if necessary—in promoting a settlement, and then sell off land at a profit? We should like to know if any of these eighteenth-century proprietors made more than they lost in their ventures. Dr. Akagi does not tell us, but he makes it clear that from a business point of view it was usually a case of too much available land and too few pioneers.

In spite of very apparent care and thoroughness the author is now and then in honest error. Admitting that quit-rents existed on paper in New Hampshire, he is mistaken in assuming that no serious attempt was made to collect them. If Governor John Wentworth told the truth to the colonial secretary, this source of revenue brought in at least £500 which Wentworth wisely expended upon roads through the province. Nor is it accurate to state that the New Hampshire charters “invariably reserved 500 acres for the governor”. This was true when Benning Wentworth was governor, but the practice was not continued by his successor.

The book is marred by a multitude of typographical errors, which must be even more distressing to the author than to the reader. These occur most often in proper names. When Richard Wibird appears as “Ricjard Wibrid” the name is hardly recognizable outside of New Hampshire. The bibliography is excellent with the exception of one item. Why not give the authority on Mount Desert history his full name, or at least his initials? “Sawtell” may be adequate, but “Sawtelle, William Otis” would be better. Aside from these details Dr. Akagi’s work is highly commendable, and although it makes no claim to literary merit it is always lucid and far more readable than the average doctoral thesis.

LAWRENCE S. MAYO.

Life of Stephen Arnold Douglas. By FRANK E. STEVENS. [Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society, vol. XVI., nos. 3-4.] (Springfield, Ill.: the Society. 1924. Pp. xi, 246-673.)

THIS volume attests the editor’s designation as “the result of many years of painstaking labor”, as an “appreciative account of the life and services of one of the greatest Americans”. In many ways it justifies the venture into the field of authorship at an advanced age and without formal training along historical lines. It carries Douglas through his career in a fairly well-balanced narrative of political developments. The author sets his gaze upon the greatness of Douglas after 1857 and, as he works toward that goal, he allows the later statesmanship of the man to illuminate the earlier stages of his career. One feels at times, however, that there is too much anticipation of later stages of development.

After Douglas’s election to the Senate the author deals with him almost exclusively as a dominant factor in determining the course of the

sectional controversy. Douglas is more than ever the hero of popular sovereignty, after 1848 "its stoutest champion, never swerving therefrom". This issue is carefully traced through the crisis of 1850, through the presidential elections that followed, and through the various phases of the territorial question. Perhaps the biographer is too easily persuaded of the dominant influence of Douglas; for instance, he states that in 1852 both political parties reaffirmed the Douglas doctrine of popular sovereignty. Douglas is also made an advocate, from the beginning, of the doctrine of unfriendly legislation; whatever slight exaggeration this may involve may be justified by the surviving traditions that Douglas first exploited that doctrine at the Freeport debate. This is important because the evidence shows that it was Douglas's opposition to the Le-compton Constitution that cost him his breach not only with the administration but also with the Southern Democracy. That these Southern Democratic leaders were inconsistent in their disappointment with the doctrine of unfriendly legislation warrants attention although perhaps not the censorious moralizing that develops in certain instances (see especially pp. 593, 600). The author finds the clue to Douglas's leadership in his expectation that climate and the rapid peopling of the West by Northerners would peacefully stop the spread of slavery on the North American continent, and the key to his greatness in that such a course might have prevented civil war and in that Lincoln was eventually forced to the position of placing the Union above any consideration of freedom *versus* slavery.

This biography is a very inadequate picture of Douglas as the representative of Western sectionalism; certainly an important, if not paramount, interest was in the development of the West. Those who have been following the controversy over the origin of the repeal of the Missouri Compromise restriction will be surprised to find that the volume does not have a single line upon the importance in this connection of Douglas's plans for transcontinental railroad development. This is certainly a most significant weakness. The influence of Senator Atchison is casually discussed and ruled out of a place of importance. Various items are cited to show that the real demand for repeal came from the Pierce administration; Mr. Stevens feels that this evidence is "conclusive".

A number of minor errors and misstatements result from the author's lack of familiarity with the background of his story, especially with the facts of Southern history. The reference to the Southern caucus of 1848-1849 is misleading (p. 387); the reference to social and political conditions in North Carolina gives a wrong impression (p. 397); Jefferson Davis was not nominated for governor of Mississippi in 1851 until after Governor John A. Quitman had withdrawn, so that his nomination did not force the nomination of Henry S. Foote as stated (p. 419). One is disposed to be skeptical about the statement that Douglas made the

first speech in a free state in defense of the Fugitive Slave Law (p. 416) and about the claim that Douglas in a Fourth of July speech at Philadelphia made "the first public denunciation" of the Know Nothing party and "did more to put that party to rout than any other agency" (p. 470, note).

There is little, except an unsystematic documentation in foot-notes, to suggest the extent of Mr. Stevens's researches. There is no indication that he has combed through the works of contemporaries for items on Douglas; at times he is content to quote certain items of this sort at second hand from biographers and general writers. It is not even clear that he has made use of the very valuable Lanphier papers, which might easily have been secured. There is no evidence of the use of certain recent monographs like Nichols, *The Democratic Machine*. His citations reveal at times too much of a tendency, even on controverted points, to rely for a decision upon octogenarian reminiscence (see pp. 463-464, 475, 523, etc.). In certain instances (see pp. 414-415) he claims to correct existing accounts without citing any authorities whatever. The work is divided into thirty untitled parts, not always with an evident reason for the break. The last chapter analyzes the social and economic phases of Douglas's life and sums up his political career. It is unfortunate that the first half-dozen pages of the biography were not included in this later portion, where they belong, if at all, and where they would have attracted less attention. The work has no index; it is generously supplied with illustrations, mainly portraits.

ARTHUR C. COLE.

A History of the United States. By EDWARD CHANNING. Volume VI. *The War for Southern Independence.* (New York: Macmillan Company. 1925. Pp. vii, 645. \$4.75.)

READING a new volume of Professor Channing's *History of the United States* is like attending a meeting of the American Historical Association. The author seems almost as broadly representative of scholarship in this great field as is the Association itself, and as the reader follows the amendment and revision of one detail after another he has the reassuring sense that he is catching up with the progress of modern inquiry. The impression is deepened by the generous annotation, marked by firmness and particularity as well as, occasionally, a salty humor; this annotation has from the first been an outstanding feature of the work. As in previous volumes there are scattered through the book acknowledgments of special aid on this point and that, from people in all parts of the country; the author and his great enterprise are so widely known and respected that scholars everywhere are proud to contribute a suggestion or a table of facts, just as a hundred years ago the whole scientific world sent specimens to Cuvier. The interest in his steadily growing history

is the greater because of the general feeling that this is probably the last of its kind. Even a quarter-century ago when the *American Nation* series was projected, it was generally believed that the materials of American history had become too vast for one man independently to digest the whole into a narrative. The range of materials is strikingly suggested in this volume; the bibliographical comment touches on literally thousands of items: not only official records, which Mr. Rhodes dealt with so impressively, and contemporary periodical literature, which after his custom Mr. McMaster examined to such good purpose in writing on this period, but statistical tables, reports of conventions, and forgotten books and articles by obscure but valuable witnesses. Some prime material too is here extensively exploited for the first time, as, for example, Rowland's ten-volume collection of Jefferson Davis's papers. Professor Channing also reassesses some familiar sources; in the light of recent studies he uses Welles's diary with great caution.

One lays down the volume (as one leaves a meeting of the American Historical Association) with his knowledge and belief revised in detail, but not as a whole. This is not the kind of general interpretation that Mr. Beard may some time write of the great crisis; one discerns no thematic pattern such as might mark a similar work of Professor Turner. The author states the limit to which he is willing to go: "A quarter of a century ago or a third of a century ago, it was customary to lay great stress on the influence of economic factors; now it is more often the case to emphasize the sociological or psychical change that is wrought by changed modes of living and by the general operation of economic factors" (p. 383). He illustrates how the mode of living influences the mode of thinking, by tracing the effect of east-west railroad building in the Ohio Valley, which had been long in doubt on the question of slavery. The result was a growing solidarity in the North based, as the author hints in the statement quoted above, on contacts that were social as well as those that were economic, or perhaps we should say social in other ways than economic. In dealing with the general economic background of the war he takes up the rising price of slaves and says, "more slaves not more land was the need of the South" (pp. 16, 150, 211-218). But might it not be argued that the acquisition of more first-quality soil under the flag, in Cuba or other nearby tropical regions, would have made even the fifteen-hundred-dollar slave profitable to Southern capitalists? Perhaps the real cure for the South's economic trouble was to grow less cotton; four pages on Southern manufactures show that many publicists saw this to be true.

There is less attempt in this volume than in its predecessor to swing the whole circle of American life. Perhaps the author intends in his next offering to revert to this period in tracing such "movements" as that for woman's suffrage, for labor organization, for public libraries, for temperance, especially as a force in politics; or perhaps he feels that Mr.

McMaster's chapter on "Social Ferment" in the 'fifties is enough. The problems of a standard historian gleaning over a field that has been harvested by Mr. Rhodes and Mr. McMaster, to say nothing of others, must oftentimes be puzzling. One novelty is found in the note of social psychology, especially in the author's explanation of the failure of the South. "It would seem at least open to debate how far the collapse of the Confederacy can be attributed to the lack of essential supplies", he says (p. 521); "the Southern people, had they so wished, could have held out for a long time" (p. 613); "the will to fight had gone from large sections of the Southern people" (p. 621). Not only did the politicians desert Davis, but desertions in the Southern army became appallingly numerous. "The ladies were becoming despondent of our ultimate success in the war", wrote a soldier; "I am for a tidal wave of peace", wrote an officer's wife; as to the ladies, "continued inability to satisfy one's desire for adornment and for unessential articles of diet, when prolonged, did much to wear down the nerve of 'Southern Society'" (p. 519). Professor Channing believes that with the resources at hand the South by fighting on could have tired out the North and won its point, but it got discouraged first. The evidence presented to sustain this whole thesis is suggestive rather than sufficient, but a controversy has been opened. It requires no occult powers to prophesy that it will be interesting.

Naturally, Professor Channing in emphasizing some matters has neglected others. Few will cite this volume on the great debate of 1850, the campaign of 1852, the Lincoln-Douglas debates, the Crittenden Compromise, or the War Democrats, to take five examples; but there will be frequent reference to such sections as that on the settling of Kansas, the disunion sentiment in the North (pp. 180 ff.), the division of families by the war (pp. 304-305), relations with England, and the production of arms for the Confederacy. The sections on the military campaigns have the merit of being clear; the theme seems to be the development of competence in the Northern staff. There is a succinct and intelligible chapter on the navy. The portraiture of the book in general can not be said to be vivid, though judgments are passed quite definitely in many cases. Lincoln is referred to on page 255 as "that God-inspired man"; on page 295 he is "unsurpassed in modern history"; some pages later he is without parallel in the Middle Ages as well; certainly he was "incomparably above anyone who has ever walked the American stage" (p. 309). The reader must look in other books for a systematic presentation of the facts that justify this superlative praise, though one notes with interest the author's opinion that young Lincoln's awkwardness of person has been much exaggerated and that the President shrewdly exploited his awkwardness as "a part of his mode of gaining his ends". Pierce is referred to as an able man "well qualified to fill the presidential chair"; the reader whose curiosity is thus piqued regrets that he is scarcely mentioned again. This unevenness and incompleteness are really inherent in

the task; so much work has been done in this field that no one could be both original and full in one volume on the fifteen years after 1850. The author is usually cautious in generalizations, but some reader may query the statement on page 6 that "the colored inhabitants . . . formed three-quarters of the total number of human beings within the limits of the States that seceded", and that on page 586 that "probably not one man in ten in the North cared whether the negro was a slave or a free man". Everyone will deplore the inadequacy of the index in a work which will often be used for reference; it is not possible to index 637 closely packed pages with less than half as many entries.

It may be said in general—and it is high praise indeed—that Professor Channing's sixth volume justifies the hopes of his readers, that every page is marked by the trace of an original mind, functioning rather obviously in New England but severely resolved to be fair, and that his story is told with a perfect clarity of statement leaving no one at any time in doubt as to exactly what he means.

DIXON RYAN FOX.

Great Britain and the American Civil War. By EPHRAIM DOUGLASS ADAMS, Professor of History in Stanford University, California. In two volumes. (New York and London: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1925. Pp. xi, 307; vii, 340. \$10.00.)

WITH regard to the long history of Anglo-American relations there is fortunately growing up a class of historians capable of dealing with specific subjects on the basis of a real understanding of affairs and tendencies on both sides of the Atlantic. Mr. E. D. Adams's book is a striking example of this. His knowledge of British politics and politicians in the middle Victorian era is very remarkable, and his judgment of them, to my thinking, penetrating as well as impartial. He has envisaged the whole situation in Great Britain during the American Civil War, not merely one or two aspects of it. And he has brought out the movements of opinion in the different classes and sections in their true proportion. Englishmen can go to this book as the authority on the subject without any fear of being misled or any hope of being amused by the kind of misunderstanding of the nuances of things which is so commonly found in histories written by persons of another country.

The two volumes have the great merit of being thoroughly readable all through. Their structure consists of a close narrative examination of each phase of British government action in relation to the Civil War in America, based on the relative documents, interspersed with chapters explaining the contemporary currents of British opinion and the degree of their influence on Cabinet decisions. Both sides of the story—the official and the popular—are very well done. I find it indeed impossible to traverse any of the conclusions to which Mr. Adams has come.

"The Reform Bill of 1867", writes Mr. Adams,

brought a new British nation into existence, the nation decrying American institutions was dead and a "sister democracy" holding out hands to the United States had replaced it, but to this the men who had won the war for the North long remained blind. Not during the generation when Americans, immersed in a life and death struggle for national existence, felt that "he who is not for me is against me", could the generally correct neutrality of the British government and the whole-hearted support of Radical England be accepted at their true value to the North. For nearly half a century after the American Civil War the natural sentiments of friendship, based upon ties of blood and a common heritage of literature and history and law, were distorted by bitter and exaggerated memories.

It is indeed certain that if the enfranchisement of the British artisans and lower middle class had taken place just before instead of just after the American Civil War, the political press in Britain and the political classes would have taken up a position far more favorable to the North at that crisis, and American feeling toward England would have been much more friendly ever since.

For this reason the attitude of the political classes of Great Britain toward the North, as expressed even more in the crudities of the *Times*, *Punch*, and other papers than in the "generally correct neutrality" of the government, is one of the great tragedies of modern history and deserves historical study of the kind Mr. Adams gives it in these two volumes. He is quite right in supposing that the feeling of friendliness or the reverse to the North was very largely determined by the attitude of the individual toward the impending franchise question in England, and that the victory of the North accelerated the more peaceable victory of democracy in England which was accomplished by the franchise bill of 1867. When I was writing the *Life of Bright* I was often assured of this fact by political veterans, who told me that only those who lived through those times in England can know to what a degree this was the case. There were of course exceptions, like Gladstone, who was at once franchise-advocate and Southern sympathizer. But he was the exception to many rules and dragged about with him in the Radical camp many curious mental encumbrances from the dim Eldonian world whence he had emerged.

I am glad also that Mr. Adams distinguishes between the real "Southern sympathizers", with their preference for the planter "gentleman" in contradistinction from the "low Yankee tradesman"—and those sympathizers with the North who nevertheless failed to understand the situation and to give Lincoln's war policies proper support. Russell is a type of these men, who formed an important section of the nation between the Southern sympathizers on one side, and Bright and the Radicals on the other. Russell and many others preferred the Northerner to the South-

erner, without indeed knowing much about either, but mainly on grounds of slavery. They held that the South could not be reconquered in such a way as to be permanently reannexed; the Liberal interpretation of history forbade the belief that several millions of determined white men could be coerced into accepting a sovereignty they abhorred. Therefore, though the South was wrong to secede and still more wrong on slavery, it must be let go. The North would thereby be freed from the slavery taint and the United States would no longer be governed, as it had been for so long, by slave-owners and their policy. The people who thought thus knew so little about America that they believed President Lincoln when he declared, as he so persistently did at the beginning of the war, that the issue was not slavery at all but the Union only. The English, with their own recollections of 1776, believed that the Union could not be maintained by force—a wrong but not a wholly unreasonable deduction from past events.

The effect of Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation was, therefore, as Mr. Adams shows, immense in England, and indeed much greater there than Lincoln or anyone else expected. The non-conformist middle classes were roused; the Northern sympathizers, who had hitherto had to apologize for Mr. Lincoln, took the offensive and, aided by Northern victories, made a rapid conquest of English opinion. Unfortunately the country was ill represented in the political press which was that of the small enfranchised class; that class was more ignorant of and more hostile to America than the unenfranchised masses. The common people of England had many relations settled in the North as recent immigrants, from whom they heard about America, while the upper class had not intermarried with Americans to any large extent. The cottage was therefore better informed about America than the mansion. After all, the Lancashire working men and women let themselves be cheerfully starved for year after year, out of sympathy with the antislavery cause and the cause of American democracy. It was lucky, as Mr. Adams points out, that their employers found the situation endurable, because of the glut in cotton goods. But among the Lancashire employers also, not a few were, like Bright, Northern sympathizers of the most active type.

G. M. TREVELYAN.

Roosevelt and the Russo-Japanese War. A Critical Study of American Policy in Eastern Asia in 1902-5, based primarily upon the Private Papers of Theodore Roosevelt. By TYLER DENNETT. (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, Page, and Company. 1925. Pp. xi, 357. \$3.50.)

MR. TYLER DENNETT has written a brief but notable book which will have to be taken into account by all students of modern Far Eastern his-

tory. His chief new source has been the unpublished letters of President Roosevelt to which he has had access and from which he has gathered much important material. The main lines of Roosevelt's policy in dealing with Russia and Japan were already known, but Mr. Dennett has added not a little to our knowledge. The most startling contribution is to be found (p. 2) in the President's letter to his friend Spring-Rice:

As soon as this war broke out, I notified Germany and France in the most polite and discreet fashion that in event of a combination against Japan to try to do what Russia, Germany, and France did to her in 1894, I should promptly side with Japan and proceed to whatever length was necessary on her behalf. I of course knew that your government would act in the same way, and I thought it best that I should have no consultation with your people before announcing my own purpose.

In spite of President Roosevelt's belief that by this step he prevented the Russo-Japanese war from becoming a general one, we may doubt whether there existed any necessity for this extraordinary intervention on his part. If either France or Germany had tried to interfere with Japan, England was pledged by the Anglo-Japanese Treaty of 1902 to come to the rescue, which she undoubtedly would have done—indeed she intimated as much in connection with the abuse of neutrality on the part of German colliers. Now the last thing desired by Delcassé, who directed the foreign policy of France, was a war with England. Of this he gave convincing proof again and again. And though French public opinion was naturally enough pro-Russian, it had no desire to have France risk the loss of her colonial empire in a war with England, for the sake of furthering the ambitions of Russia in the Far East. As one of the newspapers about that time put it: "Mourir pour la patrie, Oui! Oui! Mourir pour la Manchourie, Non! Non!" Germany, to be sure, had less to fear and less to lose and was also less timid, indeed the Kaiser at one time did not seem much afraid; but in her case, too, the losses and the perils might have been so appalling that no German government would have faced them without strong reasons. Altogether we may believe that when the Japanese deliberately began the conflict they were quite justified in their calculation that their alliance with England guaranteed them against the intervention of third parties. If this be true, President Roosevelt's pronouncement was gratuitous. Even Mr. Dennett, much as he admires his hero's conduct, feels constrained to admit that (p. 335) "the weakness of Roosevelt's policy lay in the fact that it could not be continued except at the expense of the Constitution of the United States".

And yet few fair critics will deny that, irregular as the President's methods were, there was much that was admirable, not to say brilliant, in his handling of a very difficult question. His essential honesty, his clear vision of possibilities, his statesmanlike grasp of the interests involved and the forces at play, his resourcefulness of action and his skill in dealing with personalities, stand out once more in striking fashion. The

Peace of Portsmouth was a well-deserved triumph for him and will remain one of the proudest of his achievements.

As for Mr. Dennett, he handles his subject well, arranging his matter clearly and convincingly. In spite of an occasional tendency (especially in the last chapter) to loose, exaggerated statement, his comments are in the main moderate as well as keen. His documentation is extensive even if one does feel that he is not as much at home in the intricacies of contemporary European politics as he is in those of the Far East. One result of this is that his treatment of Germany is not always fair. We may regret, too, though we can not count it against him, that he has not had the advantage of being able to consult the rich material on the Far East in the recent volumes of the *Grosse Politik*, or the new documents on the Peace of Portsmouth and the events leading to it in numbers 5, 6, and 7 of the *Krasny Arkhiv*, not to speak of earlier Russian publications, particularly the articles in the *Istoricheski Vestnik* for 1914. We can only hope that his sales will some day warrant him in giving us a second edition and even more satisfactory study of his topic.

ARCHIBALD CARY COOLIDGE.

MINOR NOTICES

The Story of Human Progress: an Introduction to Social Studies. By Leon C. Marshall, Professor of Political Economy in the University of Chicago. (New York, Macmillan Company, 1925, pp. xvi, 548, \$1.48.) Readers of this book will readily agree with the author that it "is neither history, nor civics, nor economics, nor anthropology, nor sociology, nor all of them combined".¹ They may, therefore, quarrel mildly with a title which so obviously implies organized history, and wonder if it would not be fairer to the contents, and to the public, to use the subtitle alone.

Part I., aiming to provide simple materials for preliminary social orientation, presents "snapshots" of Neanderthal man (pp. 7-19) and of Iroquois culture (pp. 23-67). Except for the absence of effective historical links between these "snapshots", the descriptions resemble the *Kulturbilder* with which Biedermann, sixty years ago, proposed to revolutionize history teaching. The rest of the book is almost encyclopaedic in scope, and in its extreme application of the topical plan, almost encyclopaedic in method. Man's conquest of fire, of the metals, of power devices, and so on up to ideals and aspirations, are described separately, usually with an enumeration of the chief steps from primitive times to the present. Something of the effect of a "unified whole" is produced by grouping the topics logically under four comprehensive and rather happy heads. Another bond of union is the use of the topics as texts for a continuing sermon on "living together well". The parting words to pupils are: "I have entire confidence in the future of man's progress as

¹ *Teacher's Manual to the Story of Human Progress*, p. 2.

guided by you. I envy you the joy of your battle and achievement, for I know the furious battle will end in a glorious victory—if you think straight and fight hard.”

The presentation shows a keen appreciation of the doctrine that facts must be translated into the experience of pupils, and achieves a higher degree of success in actually applying the doctrine than could reasonably be expected under the limitations imposed by the vast range and number of the facts presented. Each chapter is followed by problems and by references to “Interesting Reading” in Marshall, *Readings in the Story of Human Progress*. Many of the problems are of a kind more easily solved by children than by persons of greater sophistication, including teachers, and most of them would be equally suitable for college classes.

Other allied social studies may complain that economics has taken and held the right of way, but they will gladly give the book a first place in a literature greatly in need of contributions from scholars.

HENRY JOHNSON.

Le Génie Romain dans la Religion, la Pensée, et l'Art. Par Albert Grenier, Ancien Membre de l'École Française de Rome, Professeur à l'Université de Strasbourg. [L'Évolution de l'Humanité, ed. Henri Berr, no. 17.] (Paris, La Renaissance du Livre, 1925, pp. xiv, 503, plates, 20 fr.) In this book M. Grenier, whose earlier studies of the ancient civilizations in the Italian peninsula are favorably known to scholars, sets forth with practised hand the development of Roman culture, first under the influence of the other peoples of Italy, not only the Etruscans and Greeks, but also the indigenous Italic tribes; and then by direct contact with Greece. The work is divided into three parts: the first treats of the establishment of Rome and the growth of Latin civilization down to the third century before our era; the second deals with the period of the Republic's greatness and fall; and the third is given to the age of Augustus. The history of the empire is left for M. Victor Chapot to handle in a later volume of the series.

Grenier in no sense contents himself with repeating familiar facts and conclusions, for his study is one in the field of historical psychology, in which the growth of the Roman genius under ever changing influences is expounded with the grace and clarity of which the French are masters. According to his view, when history began, the Roman population consisted of a city plebs and a country people, the second of which was made up of a patriarchal aristocracy and a mass of peasants. These disparate elements were forced to cohere by their struggles for existence, but they displayed different characteristics. The patricians and peasants were conservative and practical, loving law and order, tenacious of their ancient forms and traditions, with no tendency toward speculation, but pragmatic and unimaginative; the city plebs, on the other hand, more complex in origin and less bound by tradition, through commerce and other means

established connections between Rome and the Etruscan, Italic, and Greek communities in the peninsula, and thereby introduced the arts and ideas which influenced, modified, and even transformed the older Roman culture. These conservative and assimilative elements were inevitably in constant conflict, and each can be discerned as operative through successive centuries, forming the Roman genius as we see it in the later Republic and at the beginning of the Empire.

Roman religion, for example, never lost its primitive, practical, and legal characteristics, although it was able freely to adopt gods, rites, and regulations from its neighbors and remoter peoples. In literature Rome went to Greece to learn, but never ceased to insist that letters must have a practical value; in philosophy too the Roman's interests were moral and wholly human. Speculation and scientific investigation he left to the Greeks, who were his teachers. His very state was organized after a Hellenistic model and then changed into an Oriental monarchy; but still the ancient ideal of the state as the centre of the citizens' interest, claiming all their loyalty and devotion, remained unbroken.

The personality of the Roman people was created by a long and slow process; and their genius was such that they were able to absorb the substance of the entire ancient world and give it a new form, which was to become the formative heritage of the succeeding centuries.

Interesting and valuable as this volume is, we must confess that it would probably have gained in force if it had been briefer; and certainly the printing of the book is abominably bad. For this naturally the author is in no sense responsible.

CLIFFORD H. MOORE.

The Office of the Grand Chamberlain in the Later Roman and Byzantine Empires. By James E. Dunlap. [University of Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series, vol. XIV., pt. II.] (New York, Macmillan Company, 1924, pp. viii, 165-324, \$1.00.) The transformation of a position of menial, personal service into one of influence and power is not an uncommon phenomenon in history. The office of Grand Chamberlain at the Byzantine court, however, affords an unusual opportunity to note the stages of such development through nearly twelve centuries. Dr. Dunlap traces the office through the late Republic and early Empire, and follows its expansion, as the imperial court grew in splendor, to one of the most important and honorable places in the administrative hierarchy. The zenith of this development was reached in the reign of Justinian, when Narses was chamberlain. Up to that time the position had retained its flavor of intimate service. Narses, in realizing the full possibilities of the office, also laid the foundation for its decline. Absent on missions civil and military, he separated himself from that close association with the imperial person on which the office had grown. Thereafter, the Grand Chamberlain was a recognized imperial official of great honor,

but in the course of time his power slipped away to others who were in more constant touch with the emperor.

The author has searched the available sources carefully, but there are many gaps in the information. In fact, only the period from the middle of the fourth to the middle of the sixth century yielded much more than fragmentary evidence. As a rule, he has confined himself rather closely to the scattered testimony, leaving the more venturesome task of filling the gaps to the reader. His rigid separation of the office as an institution from the careers of the men who held it seems a doubtful device. The latter certainly had much to do with its rapid rise and decline, and the incorporation of their careers in the development of the office would have lent an element of interest to the first part of the work which is now noticeably lacking. The careers of Eusebius, Euthérius, Eutropius, and Narses, treated separately in the latter part of the book, form the most interesting, if not the most valuable, portion of it. Narses, viewed solely as Grand Chamberlain against the background of such predecessors, gains a more favorable reputation than the more comprehensive treatments of the period usually accord him.

The work forms an admirable supplement to Boak's study of the *Magister Officiorum*, to which it owes much of its inspiration and guidance. Quite apart from its contribution to institutional history, its systematic array of information will be of great service to later workers in Byzantine history.

A. C. KREY.

Outlines of Polish History: a Course of Lectures delivered at King's College, University of London. By Roman Dyboski, Ph.D., Professor of English Literature in the University of Cracow. (New York, Oxford University Press, 1925, pp. 283, \$2.50.) We now have half a dozen short popular histories of Poland in English (and nothing of a longer and more detailed character), but this one, unlike most of the others, was written by a Pole and by a distinguished Polish scholar. It is true that his special field is not Polish history but English literature; but this fact renders him unusually competent to interpret his country to the English-speaking public, and the volume itself (in spite of a few errors of detail here and there) attests an adequate command of the subject upon which the author has chosen to write.

In undertaking an outline sketch of Polish history, Professor Dyboski has endeavored especially "to point out the psychological motives, economic foundations, and social background of events and developments"; "to escape the pitfall of burdening the tale with too many names of persons, strange and unfamiliar to the foreign reader"; and to furnish "information apt to throw light on the international position and the domestic problem of the new Polish State of to-day". The task of selection, omission, and compression has been handled, on the whole, with notable

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXXI.—II.

success. The reviewer has seldom seen an outline history in which the main lines of development have been so constantly emphasized and all that is merely picturesque or of secondary importance so rigorously eliminated. Possibly the author has at times gone too far in his desire to spare the reader names, dates, and details. In certain portions the narrative would have gained by being more concrete; more dates would have made some matters clearer; and one would have liked to see certain subjects of cardinal importance treated more fully and systematically, such as the Reformation in Poland or the constitutional system of the old Republic. Even such capital matters as the *Liberum Veto*, Confederations, or the manner of holding royal elections are nowhere clearly explained.

Nearly half the volume is given to the period since the partitions, and this seems to the reviewer much the best part of the book. It would be hard to find elsewhere in English, in any work of similar dimensions, so good an account of the era of struggles for independence, the Emigration, or the emergence within the past half-century of the society, parties, and problems of present-day Poland. Another outstanding merit of the book is the relatively large attention given to literature, education, and art, and the constant effort to correlate all sides of the national development. The author writes with commendable detachment and objectivity, not sparing severe judgments upon his countrymen in certain cases, but—in accordance with the present tendency in Polish historiography—taking a brighter view of the nation's past record than was customary a generation or two ago, in the gloomy days of the "Cracow historical school".

R. H. LORD.

English Industries of the Middle Ages. By L. F. Salzman, M.A., F.S.A. New edition, enlarged and illustrated. (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1923, pp. xx, 360, 10 s.) The second edition of this scholarly book (first published in 1913) has been improved by the introduction of numerous wood-cuts illustrating the technique of early industry, by the addition of chapters on building and fishing, and by the incorporation into the old chapters of new illustrative material drawn to some degree from sixteenth-century records. The value of the new material, as of the old, lies in its close touch with contemporary sources and in the clever binding together of heterogeneous information.

The First Century of Magna Carta: why it persisted as a Document. By Faith Thompson, Instructor in History in the University of Minnesota. [Research Publications of the University of Minnesota, Studies in the Social Sciences, no. 16.] (Minneapolis, University of Minnesota, 1925, pp. x, 123, \$1.50.) This modest and excellent contribution to our knowledge of the English constitution contains a first-rate sketch of the history

of Magna Carta as a document during the thirteenth century, with a special study of the problem why it became during that period the great charter of English liberty. This historical survey, based in part on secondary sources, describes the genesis and early amendments of the charter till it assumed its final form in 1225, the confirmations, the methods of promulgation and enforcement, the dawning traditional view of the document, and the constitutional struggles amid which the question of the charter was constantly raised. In the course of the narrative are detailed various sorts of influences which helped to make the charter survive.

Against this background stands out the main thesis of the work, that the primary reason for the growth and permanence of the charter's influence in the thirteenth century was the "lasting practical value of its provisions to all the articulate classes of the time, in matters of intense local interest which intimately concerned the duties and pleasures of everyday life". It was not just an "ancient and stirring battle cry". This conclusion rests upon the facts, that the charter at its origin was the most complete official statement of the law of the time and that throughout the century there was constant reference to its provisions: they were enforced by the courts, discussed by legal writers and others, amended and amplified by legislation from 1215 onwards. The Church relied on the charter in its struggles against king and pope. The Forest Charter, always so closely associated with the Great Charter, helped to keep the latter in the foreground. The amount of evidence bearing on these points which has been brought together by Dr. Thompson far exceeds anything adduced by previous commentators and demonstrates the enduring vitality of the law contained in the charter. It should be noted that the author includes in her citations only references to specific articles, and only such as the record definitely states are in the charter, the sole exception being some articles in certain statutes whose wording, however, obviously was derived from that document. This limitation restricts the number of cases which could be cited and would seem somewhat extreme. We might at least have a note or an appendix giving an indication of the extent to which there were appeals to the law contained in the charter, regardless of whether the recorder, whose notice is often brief, took the trouble to point out that the provision was connected with Magna Carta.

All this material must make us attach far more importance than before to the specific articles of the Great Charter as factors in the growth of that document in public esteem. In the opinion of the reviewer, however, important though this new evidence is, it is hardly sufficient to cause the abandonment of the accepted view—that the early history of the charter so closely identified it with the idea of limiting the king's power that in the struggles which ensued after Henry III. really began to rule the demands for the confirmation had in view primarily not any specific provisions, but the enforcement of its underlying principle, the control of

the king in his management of the state. But this is a matter of opinion and does not detract from the worth of this book.

Dr. Thompson's method of presentation is clear, logical, and agreeable. Her work is based upon a thorough study of the sources and her evidence is handled in sound scholarly fashion.

SYDNEY K. MITCHELL.

The Register of St. Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury, commonly called the Black Book. Edited by G. J. Turner, M.A., and Rev. H. E. Salter, M.A. Part II. [Records of the Social and Economic History of England and Wales, vol. III.] (London, Oxford University Press, the British Academy, 1924, pp. vi, 378-678.) With this volume the British Academy resumes the publication of its valuable series of social and economic records. The contents are less diversified than those of the first part of the cartulary published in an earlier volume (noticed in this *Review*, XXI. 848). They consist almost entirely of charters, final concords, farming contracts, and similar instruments relating to the estates and churches of the abbey. The properties were located in Kent and the vicinity. The documents were issued mainly in the first half of the thirteenth century, but a number are of earlier or later date. They are of value chiefly for the history of the abbey, the city of Canterbury, and several rural communities in Kent, but they supply information of interest concerning the agrarian, manorial, and feudal systems. The surrender to the monastery by manorial tenants of their rights of common in a wood (p. 470) and the grant by the abbey of a tenement for the service of waging its judicial combats (p. 456) are typical bits of such evidence. Many of the documents throw light also on the ecclesiastical organization. They deal with tithes, advowsons, pensions, the institution of chapels and their relations to parish churches, the nature of the abbey's exemption, and kindred subjects.

The editors have performed the major portion of their task excellently. The text appears to be thoroughly reliable. The index, however, is inadequate. Subjects are practically omitted, though some exceptional common nouns, selected on no apparent principle, are included. Proper nouns are generally indexed under one contemporary form, though several may appear in the text. On page 519, for example, there are four forms of Southwark, but it is indexed only under a form other than the modern, which does not appear on the page. The index fails to render the important contents of the document easily accessible to the investigator.

W. E. LUNT.

Étude sur les Colonies Marchandes Méridionales (Portugais, Espagnols, Italiens) à Anvers de 1488 à 1567: Contribution à l'Histoire des Débuts du Capitalisme Moderne. Dissertation par J. A. Goris, Licencié en Sciences Morales et Historiques. [Université de Louvain, Recueil de

Travaux publiés par les Membres des Conférences d'Histoire et de Philologie, 2^{me} série, 4^{me} fascicule.] (Louvain, Librairie Universitaire, 1925, pp. xiii, 704, plates.) Scholars will find in this book, a dissertation presented for the doctor's degree at the University of Louvain, a welcome proof that the university, after all its trials, can call forth work of the first order of merit. The author has drawn from the communal archives of Antwerp, in spite of an organization which he describes as "simply antediluvian", the material from which he has constructed a description of the commercial relations and commercial practice of Antwerp in the period of the city's greatest prosperity. He chose for his particular study the trade with Portugal, Spain, and Italy. In view, however, of the importance of that branch of trade in the early part of the sixteenth century, and because of the abundance of pertinent details with which the work is illuminated, the author should be credited with the most important contribution yet made to an understanding of European commerce as a whole in this critical period of its development.

After an introduction describing the political organization and relations of the "nations", as the commercial colonies in Antwerp were called, the author devotes about half the book to the commercial activities of their members. He describes their functions and agents, associations and business methods (including accounting), the postal traffic, conditions of transportation by land and sea, freights and insurance. He devotes long chapters, with valuable statistical tables, to the wares of the export and import trades. In the latter half of the book he supplements the work of Ehrenberg on the financial practices at Antwerp, adding much important and interesting material from local sources, and describes industrial enterprises of the southern merchants. Shorter chapters, embracing the last hundred pages, discuss contemporary theory of business ethics, particularly with respect to loans at interest, and the part played by the southern colonies at Antwerp in politics and religion, before the Catholic repression and the commercial decline of the city.

Good plates, including reproductions from account books, and merchant vessels of the period, an analytical table of contents, and indexes of places and of persons, give the book a form worthy of its substance.

CLIVE DAY.

Geschichte der Jesuiten in den Ländern Deutscher Zunge. Von Bernhard Duhr, S.J. Dritter Band. *Geschichte der Jesuiten in den Ländern Deutscher Zunge in der zweiten Hälfte des XVII. Jahrhunderts.* (Munich and Regensburg, G. J. Manz, 1921, pp. xii, 923, unbound, M. 15; bound, M. 25.) Father Duhr's volume on the German Jesuits in the second half of the seventeenth century follows the well-chosen lines of its predecessors (I., 1907; II. 1, 2, 1913) and is marked by the same high merits—thoroughness, insight, sincerity. The Great War, however, has done more than delay it. The pictorial illustration which so enriched the

earlier volumes is wanting in this, and in other ways it is less sumptuous. Even thus cheapened the original publisher (Herder, Freiburg) found its cost too great, and the work now passes to a Munich house. More than once, too, the war busied its author's pen—once for a little book of protest (*Der Lügegeist im Völkerkrieg: Kriegsmährchen*, Regensburg, 1915) against the wild tales of horror current in Germany as to the deeds of the foe. Would that on both sides there had been more of such protest!

It is not alone because its pages are now all letterpress that a single volume suffices for this half-century. It was a barren time. For the Germany left by the Thirty Years' War Father Duhr makes his own the hot words of Niebuhr: "As the common man in his wretchedness seeks to bury his trouble in debauchery, so in Germany one strove by license to drown shameful memories. The princes built palaces and aped the French court. In the towns housed luxury and misery. All spirit and taste had fled from the nation. Its language was neglected and flooded with alien words. Its literature was contemptible beyond expression: it lay prostrate in shameless despair and flaunted its obscenities and its ribaldry." Of his own order he is content to say that "the Jesuits took up again the labors disturbed or destroyed by the war and carried them forward again in substantially the old fashion". But from many a page it is clear that neither the labors nor the laborers were the peers of the old. Among the scholars it was only those who survived from the earlier day—a Jacob Balke in literature, an Athanasius Kircher in science—who kept the old level. The best of their successors in Germany were only "polyhistorians" like Masen or Caspar Schott. Their historian ascribes it in part to the censorship, and he shows us Pope Innocent X. appealing to the Jesuits in 1662 to moderate their production of books. But in censorship and repression the Jesuits surely did their full share. The old protests against superstition and cruelty by which in the earlier half-century members of the order had done it such honor are heard no more. The pleas of Tanner and Laymann and Spee were not wholly forgotten or unheeded; but it was not till a new century had opened that the Protestant jurist Thomasius won them the world's recognition. It was in numbers only that the German Jesuits made progress; and with a stationary income numbers were an embarrassment. But what is worth knowing about these dreary leaders of a dreary age Father Duhr has patiently gleaned.

GEORGE L. BURR.

Papers of Devotion of James II., being a Reproduction of the MS. in the Handwriting of James the Second now in the Possession of Mr. B. R. Townley Balfour. With an Introduction by Godfrey Davies. (Oxford, Printed for Presentation to the Members of the Roxburghe Club, 1925, pp. xxxii, 178.) Thanks to the generosity of the owner of

the manuscript of the present magnificent volume, we are now provided with material for the character, if not for the actual historical facts of James II., of much importance. If it does not add to our knowledge, it helps to an even better understanding of the man, and to the explanation of his later activities. It serves to supplement the work of Macpherson and Clarke, of whose work the present editor gives such an excellent account in his introduction. If we never find the lost "autobiography", whose history enlightens Ranke's appendixes, we now approximate it so closely that in all probability its discovery—though that seems in the highest degree improbable, so far as the considerable investigations of the reviewer indicate—would not greatly add to our information, and very likely would add little or nothing to our judgment.

The Papers of Devotion here printed in close accord with their manuscript originals are of such a character as to explain much of the reason for the Revolution of 1688. It gives point to Charles II.'s prophecy about his brother, "He will lose his kingdom through his religious zeal and his soul through his unsightly wantons". "I am sure", wrote Madame at his death, "that King James is in Heaven now. The Parisians go farther and imagine that he can work miracles, but my faith does not go as far as that." He would not, she believed, "even make a good saint".

One may well read these pages in the light of these views. But one thing seems evident. Whatever his understanding, it seems not to have increased with age; whatever his piety, it seems not to have improved his judgment; and whatever his sincerity, it did not make his literary style either clear or convincing. Of all the unusually numerous writings of his which have been preserved to us, these pages afford the best examples of that amazing turgidity, that endless involution, that curious dullness, which characterizes them all. It gives fresh point to those French critics of the court of the Grand Monarque who conceived him as scarcely less than a fool, a pious fool, but not a royal one.

W. C. ABBOTT.

Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of Anne, preserved in the Public Record Office. Volume II., 1703-4. Edited by Robert Pentland Mahaffy. (London, H. M. Stationery Office, 1924, pp. xii, 765, 25 s.) The State Papers, Domestic, in the Public Record Office for Anne's reign are unusually barren. The reviewer's examination of many of them disclosed little of value as contrasted with the richness of the State Papers, Foreign. This is partially due to important officials considering all their state correspondence as private property and carrying most of it away with them when they retired.

Mr. Mahaffy has enriched his volume by including material from the Entry Books (secretaries' letter-books) and the State Papers relating to the navy, to Scotland and Ireland. Nevertheless, the book is disappoint-

ing on the greater figures of the reign—Marlborough, Godolphin, Harley, and Queen Anne herself, of whom we get scarcely a trace. It is somewhat more valuable for the work of the secretaries of state, although even here far more of Nottingham's confidential correspondence may be found in the British Museum than in Chancery Lane.

The volume covers little more than a year. The earlier portion contains frequent references to the Cabinet Council, the Cabinet, and the "Committee of the Cabinette". Considerable light is shed upon the administration of Ireland, through the letters of Edward Southwell to Nottingham. This work, however, is most satisfactory upon naval administration in the Mediterranean, and the letters of the two secretaries of state to Admiral Rooke in themselves sufficiently refute the oft-repeated heresy that England became possessed of a vast colonial empire in a fit of absent-mindedness.

The work is carefully edited, and the writer is able to vouch for the accuracy of the translations. For reasons of economy, the introduction is exceedingly brief, but the index of 150 pages is unusually valuable. This is the second volume of the series on the reign of Anne, and, since it was practically completed before 1914, we look forward to the appearance of the third at an early date.

WILLIAM THOMAS MORGAN.

The Rise of the Irish Linen Industry. By Conrad Gill, M.A., Litt.D. (Oxford, Clarendon Press; London and New York, Oxford University Press, 1925, pp. xi, 359, 16 s.) In this excellent work about "real Irish linen", matters of technical, antiquarian, and artistic interest are subordinated. The author seeks to explain the localization of linen manufacturing in Ulster, to describe the connections of government with the industry, and to trace the transition from domestic to factory production. The last object he claims as his "main interest"; but in this he is not entirely consistent, as he later avows his "special subject" to be "the period of domestic production".

There is a mass of significant detail, organized and presented with tolerable clearness, in connection with each of these main topics. Long-continued governmental encouragement of the industry in the south failed, by reason of many factors, chiefly the system of land tenure. The success of Ulster was due not so much to governmental stimulus as to a superior land system, adapted to domestic manufacturing, combined with Huguenot immigration and certain other favorable circumstances. In spite of his apparent *laissez-faire* predilections, the author presents the case convincingly against current views which would credit political support largely with the growth of the industry. On the other hand, it is well to remember that the policy of stimulating flax growing and linen manufacturing, combined with the policy of restricting or prohibiting various other industrial and commercial activities, must have had much

to do with the general trend of capital and energy toward the linen industry, though the desirability of both positive and negative phases of public policy remains questionable. The author shows that governmental dealings with Ireland in this connection, as in many others, were inefficient and frequently corrupt. The most distinctive portion of the book is the elaborate picture of the organization of domestic manufacturing preceding the introduction of mechanical technique and factory methods.

The mass of detail presented in foot-notes and addenda indicates imperfect assimilation of data, but the author's problem was difficult by reason of the minuteness of his researches. There is a measurably successful attempt to correlate his data with similar facts concerning other countries, and with the larger aspects of economic history. The documentation is extensive and includes references to the intimate business records of particular firms. Some use was made of records since lost in the destruction of the Dublin Public Record Office. Errors seem to have been reduced to a minimum. The book is attractively printed and bound, and there are some pertinent maps, diagrams, and photographic illustrations.

WITT BOWDEN.

Autour de Robespierre. Par Albert Mathiez. (Paris, Payot, 1925, pp. 259, 20 fr.) M. Mathiez has brought together in this volume a round dozen of studies dealing with the latter part of Robespierre's career; with one exception, all have previously appeared in print, the most of them in the *Annales Révolutionnaires* of which M. Mathiez is the editor. Apart from the first three and the last, the essays deal with the last months of Robespierre's life in 1794, with the intrigues against him, with the divisions in the Committee of Public Safety, and with the tragic dénouement of 9 Thermidor, the work thus possessing a time-unity that does not appear on the surface. The first essay, treating the activities of the younger Robespierre in Franche-Comté in January and February, 1794, supplies further evidence in support of M. Mathiez's contention that the elder Robespierre was not in sympathy with the extreme terrorist activities of some of the deputies-on-mission. In the study on the worship of the Supreme Being, M. Mathiez disposes of the traditional interpretation that attributes the origin of the movement to Robespierre, making it largely a personal matter; Robespierre was the spokesman of the Convention and the Convention simply gave expression to a widespread sentiment in favor of religion, but against reactionary ecclesiasticism. Through the use of manuscripts or rare printed sources, hitherto wholly or partially unused, M. Mathiez casts more light upon the intrigues against Robespierre in the spring of 1794 and upon the divisions in the Committee of Public Safety. The longest, the most novel and most important of the studies is that dealing with the rôle of Robes-

pierre on the night of 9 Thermidor. Here for the first time, thanks to fresh evidence and new interpretations and combinations of the old, we have an account of the events of that tragic night that relegates the traditional account to the scrap-heap. The famous document, now in the Carnavalet, bearing the first two letters of Robespierre's name and what has been supposed to be drops of Robespierre's blood, M. Mathiez robs of its tragic significance. It has long been assumed that the document was lying on the table in the council chamber of the city hall and that Robespierre was attaching his signature to it when the troops of the convention broke in, Robespierre was shot, and his blood fell upon the document. From material found among the papers of the section of Pikes—the section to which the document was addressed—M. Mathiez shows that the letter was received by the section before midnight on the ninth and was sent the next morning to the united committees of Public Safety and Security; hence the paper could not have been on a table in the city hall when Robespierre was shot. As to the question whether Robespierre was shot or attempted to commit suicide, in the opinion of M. Mathiez, "the version of suicide has in its favor all the testimony dating from the time of the event"; the story of the shooting of Robespierre by Méda rests upon nothing but Méda's account, which M. Mathiez regards as "très suspecte".

These essays show all the excellencies and shortcomings of M. Mathiez's work: indefatigable research, brilliancy of interpretation and combination, accompanied by insufficient emphasis upon the evaluation of evidence and a tendency to go beyond the evidence, to confound, in constructive reasoning, probability or even possibility with fact. But, after all is said, he is the most productive as well as the most suggestive living writer on the French Revolution.

FRED MORROW FLING.

The Early Life and Letters of Cavour, 1810-1848. By A. J. Whyte. (London and New York, Oxford University Press, 1925, pp. xx, 384, 15 s.) Here is a book that is at once sound and entertaining. The author proposed to himself the task of placing before the English-speaking public selections from the letters and the diary of Cavour and from other materials that have been brought to the surface since the publication in 1886 of Berti's *Il Conte di Cavour avanti il 1848*, with a connective tissue of explanation and comment. His object is to enrich the picture of Cavour the statesman, as he is presented in such a biography as Thayer's, with a portrait of Cavour the man, as he revealed himself during the period preceding his entrance into politics—a period embracing three-quarters of his life. Mr. Whyte has done this well. The book is not one in which will be sought information new to students of Cavour. It is drawn from materials readily accessible in Italian, and in 1912 enriched, interpreted, and clarified in the masterly *La Giovinezza del Conte*

di Cavour by Francesco Ruffini, to whom Mr. Whyte fully acknowledges his indebtedness. On the other hand, Mr. Whyte's volume is much more than a scissors-and-paste affair. He has made his selections wisely. Genial and sympathetic and writing always *con amore*, he has known how to stand aside and let the young Cavour reveal himself, and yet he has supplied the explanations and rapid sketches of situation necessary to the general reader. His volume is really a book.

So extraordinarily precocious in mind and character, Cavour stepped into politics fully formed, and an intimacy with his early career not only commends him to the reader's affection, but can not fail to influence one's evaluation of his statesmanship. One perceives, for example, the importance of his profoundly affectionate loyalty to the members of the patriarchal family at Santena, representative of the Piedmontese aristocracy, against whose political standards he so fearlessly revolted, in preventing his juncture with the rebellious element and swinging him around to a moderate liberalism. Again, one sees how the career of farm-manager molded his thinking. At Leri he learned the connection between pig-raising and unity; and in 1846 he declared that it was the locomotive and not conspiracies that would redeem Italy. The influence of Cavour's practical apprehension of the economic movement of his century has been underestimated and receives a welcome emphasis from Mr. Whyte.

The liquidation of a few obscurities in the translations and a correction of the author's strange slip in his several references to the "Constitution of 1847", the concession of which he has correctly dated in describing the event, would leave little to be said in criticism of the text as such.

KENT ROBERTS GREENFIELD.

The Empire at War. Edited by Sir Charles Lucas, K.C.B., K.C.M.G. [For the Colonial Institute.] Volume IV. (London and New York, Oxford University Press, 1925, pp. v-xiv, 620, maps, 28 s.) This is the African volume of Sir Charles Lucas's collaborative history of the British Empire at war, the earlier volumes of which have been noticed in this *Review*. It is divided into six parts, which deal, respectively, with West Africa, East Africa, Central Africa, South Africa, the African Islands, and British Somaliland and the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan. This division on the basis of geography is probably the most satisfactory that could have been adopted, though it results in some overlapping. For example, the conquest of German East Africa is described as a whole in part II., and the contribution thereto of the forces of the Union of South Africa is the subject of a special chapter in part IV. The story of the military operations against the Germans in Africa—the conquest of Togoland, the Cameroons, German East Africa, and German South-West Africa—is told in detail, and in reading it one understands the desire of Germany

to keep the war out of Africa, for there it could have only one result. Attention is paid to the internal history of all the British dependencies in Africa so far as it has to do with the war, and especially, as is fitting, to the war activities of the Union of South Africa. As in earlier volumes in this history the weight of facts sometimes becomes oppressive, but this is perhaps unavoidable in a work that lives up to its professed object of giving a complete record of the efforts made during the war by every unit of the Empire, from the largest to the smallest. The volume is profusely illustrated and equipped with helpful maps.

The Discovery of Australia. By George Arnold Wood, Professor of History in the University of Sydney. (London, Macmillan and Company, 1922, pp. xvii, 541, maps, 25 s.) Of a highly instructive and entertaining character is this volume of Professor Wood's on the discovery of Australia, or, more accurately, of Australasia, since its story is not of the island continent alone but includes also the smaller islands around about including those of the separate political entity, New Zealand. In scope and style the work is very like Fiske's *Discovery of America* and like it, too, in being the outgrowth of lectures. Somewhat unfortunately, indeed, the author pays tribute to Fiske, whose volumes he "continually had at hand" and found "fascinating and most helpful". One might wish that he had found them less helpful, particularly where Amerigo Vespucci was concerned. However, Professor Wood is far more reliable than Fiske, much more the scholar. His mistakes are chiefly due to carelessness. Some of them are undoubtedly typographical. "Corbet" appears instead of "Corbett", "M'Nab" instead of "McNab", and Parkman's *Montcalm and Wolfe* as *Wolfe and Montcalm*.

The story of discovery begins in the old familiar way, introduced, that is, by an account of cosmographical and geographical ideas antedating the expeditions inspired and financed by Prince Henry the Navigator. There is no pretension to originality and the author's indebtedness to earlier authorities like Justin Winsor and Beazley, his friend, is frankly acknowledged. It is very interesting, however, to have Australia in the place of vantage usually occupied by America and speculations as to the existence of a great southern land set forth instead of those of a western. In relation thereto the Marco Polo narratives take on a new significance.

Following the introductory chapters comes a most delightful account, strictly chronological, of Spanish and Portuguese expeditions, then Dutch, and finally French and English. The importance of New Guinea, of the Solomon Islands, and of New Britain is well indicated and the reader's interest centres in the nautical career of such men as Mendaña, Quiros, Torres, Tasman, Bougainville, and others. The greatest of them, Captain James Cook, brings up the rear. He it was who, by discovering the east coast of Australia, was able to determine the real nature of the southern land so long sought for. But the story does not end with his

exploits. It goes on to recount those of his immediate successors, the principal being Bass and Flinders.

The latter part of the work is no more the result of original research than is the earlier but it is the result of new readings, new comparisons, new interpretations. Prepared wholly in Australia it was dependent upon printed sources almost exclusively, with one very notable exception, Banks's Journal, which the author describes as the "treasure" of the Mitchell Library in Sydney. The printed sources were however of the very best, and chiefly such as that library affords in great abundance. In form the bibliography is poor but the maps are good.

ANNE H. ABEL-HENDERSON.

Australian Constitutional Development. By Edward Sweetman, M.A., Litt.D. With an Introduction by Professor Ernest Scott. (Melbourne, Macmillan and Company, 1925, pp. xxxi, 453, 25 s.) One of the most striking evidences of the growing spirit of Australian nationalism is to be found in a quickening interest in the early records of the country's development. Australian writers have at last come to experience a sense of pride in the splendid struggle of the early patriots to transform their country from a penal settlement into a free and independent self-governing community.

The present volume is concerned primarily with the constitutional aspects of this struggle. Fortunately, the author has not limited his treatment to the purely local phases of the subject. He has looked upon the history of the constitutional development of Australia not as a separate and distinct phenomenon but rather "as a part of the history of the constitutional evolution of the British commonwealth of nations". One of the most interesting points that the author has brought out is the close and intimate connection between the Canadian constitutional struggle and that in Australia. The publication of Lord Durham's celebrated report aroused the keenest interest throughout the Australian colonies. The liberal principles therein proclaimed were hailed as a new Magna Carta for all the colonies. The movement for colonial autonomy was in truth a reflection to a large degree of the more liberal political philosophy of the motherland.

Dr. Sweetman's latest volume more than sustains his reputation as an impartial, painstaking scholar. The public libraries and archives of England and Australia have been ransacked for documentary material. The book is therefore something more than an authoritative treatise on the early history of the colonies; it is, in addition, a most valuable repository of original sources of constitutional material.

There are, however, some manifest limitations in Dr. Sweetman's treatment. The author has been so much concerned with the study of the various stages of the constitutional life of the colonies that he has almost entirely lost sight of the social and economic factors out of which

the constitutional struggle so largely arose and which so materially affected the whole political movement. For example, the influence of the gold discoveries upon the political life of the country receives but scant consideration, and the play of party politics in England and its reaction in the colonies are almost entirely neglected. As an offset, however, the author has succeeded in bringing out clearly for the first time the important part which was taken in England by the parliamentary agents of the Australian colonies.

The appendixes contain a valuable collection of official despatches, private correspondence, and parliamentary papers relating to the constitutional development of the colonies, together with a selected bibliography of modern and contemporary books and newspapers dealing with the period in question. It is sincerely to be hoped that Dr. Sweetman will see fit to continue his studies in this field which he has made so peculiarly his own.

C. D. ALLIN.

The Political Awakening of the East: Studies of Political Progress in Egypt, India, China, Japan, and the Philippines. By George Matthew Dutcher, Hedding Professor of History in Wesleyan University. (New York and Cincinnati, Abingdon Press, 1925, pp. 372, \$2.00.) Lectures given on the steadily increasing number of foundations are by no means always worthy of preservation. This book by Professor Dutcher is one of the happy exceptions. Containing the Bennett Lectures of Wesleyan University for the year 1923, it is the result of wide reading and of observations made in 1921-1922 during a sabbatical leave. It deals with Egypt, India, China, Japan, and the Philippines and is principally concerned with recent political history and constitutional development in these lands. The author indulges in no flights of literary style. His is a sober, clear, and compact narrative, with here and there enlightening comments, all the more useful because they are made modestly and with the caution and poise of the true historian. By supplementary notes attached to all but the last chapter events are brought down to the autumn of 1924. The book is chiefly of value as a synopsis of events of the past two decades. In no other one volume with which the reviewer is familiar is there to be found so excellent a summary of the political and constitutional history of the countries dealt with for the period during and after the Great War. Some attention is paid to economic, intellectual, and religious developments, but not enough to make these sections equal to the others. The reviewer has noted only a few relatively minor mistakes of fact. Thus on page 115 it is the valley of the Hoang-ho and not the Yang-tse that "has been one of the cradles of the human race and one of the great sources from which civilization has been diffused". Peace and order in China have, too, been recently rather more disturbed than the comment on page 159 would indicate. From the author's com-

ments there might be more dissent, for they are matters of judgment. He favors, for example, the continuation of some sort of control of the United States over the Philippines. His opinions are given so temperately, however, and are offered with such evident fairness and lack of bias, that any criticism is more than half disarmed. The final chapter, on Problems of Progress in the East, is an illuminating series of reflections upon the entire situation. It may be because the author has reacted against some of the alarmist books of recent years, or it may be because he has been engrossed with political and economic movements, but he has very little to say of the resentment of non-European peoples, especially of the student class, against the domination and aggression of Occidental nations. This is, of course, one of the prominent features of the present situation in Asia. Professor Dutcher has given us a book that for general reading and reference will be of value for several years to come.

K. S. LATOURETTE.

The Challenge of Asia. By Stanley Rice. (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1925, pp. 256, \$2.25.) The title is the author's epigram for the present situation rather than the theme of his volume. The book is neither a history of Asia's relations with the rest of the world nor a discussion of the present situation; it is rather an essay, or indeed a collection of seven brief essays, on aspects of the relations of European and Asiatic peoples. The reader naturally looks for a clear definition of the challenge and for a logical exposition of its antecedents and of its implications and consequences. Only one who has struggled with the task can realize how utterly impossible it is to be explicit and coherent in elucidating the problems of Asia. If the reader will be considerate enough to forego rigorous logic and convincingly demonstrated conclusions, he will find the perusal of the volume profitable. Practically all the observations and deductions are accurate for large groups; they can not always be accepted as safe generalizations for a whole national unit, much less for all Asia. There are occasional slips such as the reference to "Hideyoshi, the great emperor" (p. 95).

The author places India in the foreground, perhaps because he knows it at first hand, perhaps because it is where the pot boils most noisily. To Japan—the Japan of the Meiji era—he gives frank and hearty admiration rather than pays the tribute of thorough acquaintance and comprehending insight. China receives scant attention, not because of its deserts, but apparently because of the author's limitations. Though the treatment is substantially chronological, the author reveals little more than a superficial, though usually accurate, knowledge of history.

European supremacy is represented as based on military power, maritime achievement, the science of politics, administrative capacity, political stability, scientific discovery, and application of science to commerce. The key-note of Asiatic ethics is reverence; of European, truth. To the

Asiatic dignity is of the highest import; he resents "the perverted feeling of racial superiority entertained by the whites". Interesting observations on Asiatic migration and coolie labor are sympathetic rather than approving. Asiatic culture, especially Indian music, receives liberal encomiums. Christianity seems to be regarded as a needless and complicating intrusion, certainly not as a present blessing or a potential solvent of Asia's problems. In the concluding paragraphs the writer declares that the "challenge" is not economic competition in commerce and industry, but, on the contrary, it is political. Asiatics are busily studying the basis of European supremacy and are finding it in material prosperity based upon applied science; the writer believes that it should be found in character expressing itself through democratic government.

GEORGE MATTHEW DUTCHER.

Arredondo's Historical Proof of Spain's Title to Georgia: a Contribution to the History of One of the Spanish Borderlands. Edited by Herbert E. Bolton. (Berkeley, University of California Press, 1925, pp. xvii, 382, maps.)

The Debatable Land: a Sketch of the Anglo-Spanish Contest for the Georgia Country. By Herbert E. Bolton and Mary Ross. (Berkeley, University of California Press, 1925, pp. xiii, 138, maps.)

Under the treaty of 1670 all English settlements south of Charleston were intrusions into Florida. Such was Arredondo's argument, here printed for the first time from the manuscript in the Archives of the Indies. The memoir appears in Spanish and in translation, annotated, furnished with maps and illustrations, and with a valuable historical introduction which has also been given separate publication as a collaborative work. For proof the Spanish engineer drew heavily upon Barcía, but also upon his own knowledge of that disputed border, and upon the archives of San Agustín and Havana. To the Spanish legal case the English, relying chiefly upon charter grants, never made convincing answer, though in the Public Record Office are several comparable memorials. But there was another sanction of which the English were complacently conscious—actual possession.

How was that possession achieved? Upon this, document and historical sketch throw much light, some of it quite new. Bolton and Ross have used most of the available materials in print, contemporary and non-contemporary. Their distinctive contributions, however, are in the chapters on the Guale missions before 1670, and on the Anglo-Spanish contest for that coastal region, and for the hinterland, where they have levied upon the Archives of the Indies. For instance, it is for the first time made clear that the Lower Creeks were seated on the Chattahoochee circa 1685, and that their removal to the Ocmulgee was the culmination of a dramatic contest between Spanish friars and soldiers and English traders. After 1713 archival sources are rarely cited, and there is an-

other scale of treatment in the chapters which deal with the diplomatic controversies over Fort King George and Oglethorpe's colony, with the Georgia phase of the war of 1739-1742, and with the Neutral Ground and the Treaty of Paris.

It is hoped that this sketch is a prospectus for a more complete study of a neglected Spanish borderland. Then account must be taken of matters here omitted—of a whole series of contests for the Creek alliance, of several missions from San Agustín to Charleston preceding that of September (not March), 1725; of the Palmer expedition (1728), of the Florida question in the negotiations of 1730, etc. Valid ground for criticism exists in the ignoring of the French angle of this imperial triangle. The English intrusions of 1721 and 1733 can not really be understood without reference to English fears of French "encirclement".

A few slips have been noted. Ocheese and Yuchi were not identical, even though the Spanish spelled the former "Uchizes" (p. 54). On the two excellent maps (at the front and opposite p. 80) it would be hard to justify the location of the Yamasee. And had Insh, *Scottish Colonial Schemes*, come to the attention of the authors an error in the date of the Cardross colony would have been avoided (p. 37). But these and other such are small blemishes. This vivid narrative of "Spain's resistance to the English in the country which is now Georgia" sustains the reputation of Professor Bolton and his school for sound and enterprising scholarship.

V. W. CRANE.

The Wyllys Papers: Correspondence and Documents chiefly of Descendants of Governor George Wyllys of Connecticut, 1590-1796. [Collections of the Connecticut Historical Society, vol. XXI.] (Hartford, the Society, 1924, pp. xi, 567, \$5.00.) The Wyllys papers, carefully preserved from destruction by descendants of the Wyllys family, are here printed through the kind offices of Mr. Lemuel D. Welles of New York City. Mr. Welles secured the papers, offered them to the Connecticut Historical Society for publication, and himself prepared an excellent introduction and memoir of Wyllys. Mr. Bates, librarian, and chairman of the publication committee, has edited them with his usual thoroughness and accuracy. Made up of documents that had accumulated in the hands of Wyllys and his successors for four generations and extending in time from 1633 to 1796, they constitute a very miscellaneous assortment of letters, deeds, lists, accounts, depositions, reports, diaries, and the like, a very large proportion of which have an official or semi-official character. They supplement the other materials available for the history of Connecticut and touch in one way or another many of the important questions that concerned the colony. There is much about early contacts with England and later contacts with Antigua and Barbados; a great deal of local detail about land, which seems to show that there were

more tenancies in Connecticut than is commonly supposed; something about boundary disputes with New York, Rhode Island, and Massachusetts; and letters of importance from or about John Scott, Abraham Pierson, Richard Nicholls, Edmund Andros, Jared Eliot, Jacob Leisler, Benjamin Yale, etc. There are also papers relative to the Warwick patent, copper mines in Simsbury, the Spanish ship case, the Mohegan case, and a number of letters written during the Revolution that disclose no little dissatisfaction and discontent. Of special interest is the long "Reflections upon the Affairs of New England", which contains a valuable commentary on the situation in 1691. There is also an interesting paper by Gershom Bulkeley, "malcontent", on gavelkind and the tenure of Connecticut lands, and there are some census reports of 1670, which offer Mr. Welles an opportunity to discuss the question of voting in Connecticut, a privilege he thinks more frequently exercised than it is to-day. Over against this evidence for "democracy" may be set the curious document on pages 318-319, in which one John Wheeler protests to the colony against the family and ring rule in New London. Apparently the only attention this protest received was the colony's endorsement, "Honi soit qui Mali Pense", which can be interpreted to mean whatever one pleases. Though no document in this collection is of special significance, yet taken as a whole the papers are of genuine interest and an addition of real value to the material illustrating the history of colonial Connecticut.

C. M. A.

The Charleston Stage in the XVIII. Century, with Social Settings of the Time. By Eola Willis. (Columbia, South Carolina, State Company, 1924, pp. xv, 483, \$5.00.) This book is a useful addition to the history of the American stage. A large amount of such local history will have to be collected before any good synthetic work can be carried through.

The author has gone to valuable new sources as well as to the old, familiar ones. In about one hundred of the nearly five hundred pages of text there are reprinted playbills, press announcements, lists of casts, and summaries of seasons, which are in the nature of genuine source-material. In these lies the very considerable value of the volume.

These data, however, are scattered through a text which is not so much a history as a running commentary of varying degrees of relevance. Unfortunately the text is defective at many points. It lacks order, selective restraint, rhetorical restraint, and firmness of structure in chapter or paragraph or sentence. The passages on the social settings of the time are not well generalized and effectively illustrated. The implications in the raw material have not been arrived at and clearly presented. And, most unfortunately, though there is an impressive looking thirteen-page index, it is an index only of this running commentary and not of the fact-residuum.

The author and the book therefore deserve commendation for the accumulation of useful material, but unhappily they do not deserve even faint praise for the method and manner in which the material has been presented. To those who believe in the essential relationship between clear thinking and clear writing the following typical sentence will serve as evidence:

Mr. Godwin's first and only support of the gentler sex for his earliest performances, was a real heroine at heart, whatever her accomplishments, for her death, in the midst of exacting work which must have been sorely trying to one in her condition, lifts the curtain upon the pathos of the necessity of such a woman dying in harness.

Letters on the American Revolution, 1774-1776. Edited by Margaret Wheeler Willard. (Boston and New York, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1925, pp. xix, 370, \$7.50.) This collection of letters is a selection from a much larger number gathered by the editor. The Burney Collection of London newspapers in the British Museum, and files of several Bristol papers in that city, were the principal sources. *Lloyd's Evening Post and British Chronicle*, whose policy was opposition to the North ministry, together with the *London Chronicle* and the *Morning Chronicle*, were the files most used. The writers of the letters were colonists, either Loyalist or patriot, British officers and Englishmen sojourning in the colonies. The letters are chiefly valuable in revealing current opinion, for of course there are many fabrications, rumors, and exaggerated reports. One need know little of slavery to realize the absurdity of the assertion that "the flame runs like wildfire through the slaves. . . . The subject of their nocturnal revels, instead of music and dancing, is now turned upon their liberty". Rumors ran that Lord North had fled for his life to France, that Wilkes, Burke, Arthur Lee, leading an armed multitude in London, had destroyed Parliament House. British soldiers in Boston imagined a New England army of 100,000 men. Writers saw ten men in buckram where there was only one in Lincoln green, and colonists believed in that day, as great Fundamentalists believe in our time, that a million men could spring to arms between daylight and dark. There were the wildest guesses as to the numbers in arms at any place and time. British soldiers complain often of the informal American methods of warfare. They describe with scorn how they fought "Indian fashion" behind stone walls, and never "make one gallant or manly attempt on us". In a word, they did not walk up in the open, dressed in red coats, to be shot. Though the British armies might beat them on the "plains of Europe", they might easily be vanquished in the woods of America. The Americans had not "that sprightly and foppish appearance" of regular forces "when nicely powdered", but they were hardy, sober, "could endure fatigue, and were strong pedestrians", and thought it was their religious duty to defend their charters.

A notable thing about the letters was the little contemporary attention paid to the Declaration of Independence. The letters attest the great use by agitators in New England of the religious prejudice there against papists. It was very common to compare the New Englanders with Cromwell and his Puritan followers. In general it must be said that the greatest service of the editor is to bring together in a convenient form materials with which a careful investigator of Revolutionary history would for the most part be acquainted. There are some additional eye-witness accounts of Lexington, Concord, and Bunker Hill which make unusually interesting reading at this time when centenary celebrations claim for them unusual attention.

C. H. VAN TYNE.

Letters from America, 1776-1779: being Letters of Brunswick, Hessian, and Waldeck Officers with the British Armies during the Revolution. Translated by Ray W. Pettengill, Ph.D. (Boston and New York, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1924, pp. xxvi, 281, \$7.50.) The editor of these letters explains frankly why he has undertaken a new translation of Schlözer's *Briefwechsel* already undertaken in 1891 by W. L. Stone in the Munsell series. Errors, omissions, and abbreviations made a new translation seem worth while. In addition to the preface there is an introduction with an account of Schlözer and of the principal events with which the letters are concerned. The editor believes that Schlözer tried to be fair-minded, but in fact sympathized with the English, and that he was skeptical as to the success of democracy.

The letters themselves, except as to Burgoyne's campaign, add little to our knowledge of the war, but contain many diverting observations upon American life. The discomforts of the voyage to America are feelingly described, especially the storms when for two weeks one could not sleep or eat or drink properly. No one who half knows the discomforts will dream of taking a trip to America, writes one of the sufferers. Some seventy pages are given to experiences in Canada, and then comes an account of the fateful march to Saratoga. New Hampshire and its people are described, and the methods of the frontiersmen in battle. The German writer has never seen men fight lying "like bacon hunters behind trees", and slipping from tree to tree for better aim, but he credits the fighting farmers with bravery, despite their methods, not *au fait* in Europe. The Indian allies employed by Burgoyne are "heathen, tall, warlike and enterprising, but wicked as Satan". The army in the forest march ate "flour made in England and pork salted" there, brought "across oceans, great rivers, inland seas, and water-falls", costing "a kingly price". With game all about, they ate "pork at noon, pork at night, pork cold, pork hot". After the surrender at Saratoga came the experience in New England when all the "damned curious inhabitants came marching in, whole families with wives and daughters to have a

look at the prisoners". The German correspondent believed that his host charged admission. Indeed, von Steuben later swore they came to see him as if he were a rhinoceros. After their curiosity lessened these people still came to exchange their paper money for British gold. "Whole barrels full of paper money came in from distant places to take advantage of the chance to exchange." Even with paper money, they found the cost of living enormous.

Here the Hessians had an opportunity to see the American soldiers in training. They had no proper uniforms, but the clothes in which they went "to field, to church, or to the tavern". They seemed slender, handsome, sinewy, "a finely built people", excelling most of Europe "in respect to the stature and beauty of its men". Later in their Virginia camp even this interest ceased, and boredom ruled. They lived "as in a sleep".

A most noteworthy thing in the letters is the utter lack of sympathy with "the rebels", the result no doubt of propaganda, for the writers believed just what the British enemies believed. Wickedness and pleasure was the cause of the rebellion. They were too prosperous, "the rascals". The Germans, no doubt, accepted such ideas just as they did the yarns which they solemnly wrote home about the custom in Georgia of boiling eggs in the hot sands and roasting meat in it. They also made the remarkable discovery that Georgia was so unhealthy that the inhabitants rarely got older than forty years, but Germans there lived to be seventy or eighty years old!

C. H. VAN TYNE.

The Inside Passage to Alaska, 1792-1920. With an Account of the North Pacific Coast from Cape Mendocino to Cook Inlet, from the Accounts left by Vancouver and other Early Explorers, and from the Author's Journals of Exploration and Travel in that Region. By William Watson Woollen. Edited from his Original Manuscripts by Paul L. Haworth. In two volumes. (Cleveland, Arthur H. Clark Company, 1924, pp. 342; 318, \$12.50.) History is its foundation and scaffolding, and yet the stately edifice is not of or for history. Its windows are numerous and, like the eyes of its unusual builder, look out impartially on many fields of science as well as the loved field of history.

The author at the time of his death on March 26, 1921, was the senior member of the Indianapolis bar both as to age and as to length of continuous practice. As the writer of good law-books and as a successful practitioner, he achieved a fame in his vocation, and yet he will probably be remembered longer for his devotion to his avocation. Already the wild acres at Buzzard's Roost, where he led his beloved Nature Study Club of Indiana, have been renamed "Woollen's Garden of Birds and Botany". The Nature Study Club and kindred scientific organizations have erected a tablet there to his memory.

The dual nature of the man is reflected in this work. As a lawyer he sought all the facts from the sources available to him in books and in five personal trips to Alaska. As a naturalist he brought into his story references to many objects of nature, including their scientific names.

The opening chapter in volume I. tells of the approach to the shores of Alaska and the Pacific Northwest by the Vancouver Expedition of 1792. The closing chapter in volume II. deals with the work of that same expedition on the northern coast in 1794. Between those opening and concluding portions there are thirty-three other chapters where history and general information are commingled.

No bibliography is given, but frequent quotations indicate a searching of works by explorers other than Vancouver. The latter's journal, however, forms the thread running through the two volumes. The author's observations, explanations, and discussions will become history as the years bring changes and people develop desires for impressions of Alaska as it appeared in the two decades following the famous Klondike gold rush.

The author's plan of mingling history and travel is well illustrated on pages 200-201 of volume II., where he tells of meeting at Yakutat Bay Dora Keen, the mountain climber. Together they studied the Indian village and its graveyard. Some glaciers receive attention and then—"On June 17 [1794], the Discovery also quitted Port Chalmers and, two days later, anchored in Port Etches near a Russian establishment, at which they were cordially entertained".

There is a copious index. The books will prove usable and helpful to those interested in Alaska.

EDMOND S. MEANY.

Commanding an American Army: Recollections of the World War. By Hunter Liggett, Major-General U. S. A., retired. (Boston and New York, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1925, pp. vii, 208, \$2.00, maps.) In the first place, it should be stated emphatically that this is a soldierly book—soldierly in the best and highest sense of the word, in that it gives a full report of the actual situations and events in the clearest and most concise terms. This is a great contrast to the interminable waste of words in the usual "war book", and the result is a work that is readable and enjoyable. General Liggett has done a good service in giving so important a narrative in such attractive form.

This importance of General Liggett's book lies in its being an authoritative account of our military reinforcement to the Entente Allies, which turned the tide at the crisis of the World War. The author is one best qualified to tell that story, as his own successive commands measured the progress of our military development, from training camps to divisions, from the First American Army Corps to the First American Army.

It is an evidence of the breadth of mind which led to General Liggett's invaluable services, that early in his book, although pointing out the military drawbacks of our unreadiness, he yet recognizes the one great impelling force that enabled the United States to co-ordinate all its resources: "Having entered the World War, the United States did so whole-heartedly. There has been no other instance when all the military, naval, and civilian resources of a country were so promptly and completely mobilized and thrown into a conflict."

General Liggett had been ordered to France from the Western Department early in the fall of 1917, where he was detailed to study the methods of the British and French. His account of this is most interesting. There followed the period when our newly arrived troops were being used to help out the Entente Allies at need, and yet with the eventual purpose of using them as our American force instead of in accordance with the original Allied plan of scattering them among the Allies.

In the simplest terms, and without any vainglory, General Liggett tells of the ordeals by fire at Cantigny and Belleau Woods, which convinced the Allied commands that American troops could be relied upon in their own organizations. And then came the First Army Corps under General Liggett. "On July 4, 1918, the First American Army Corps took over the sector held by the Third French Army Corps in front of Chateau-Thierry, as an element of the Sixth French Army."

This quiet sentence is the introduction to the drama of mid-July, 1918, of which the broken-hearted German chancellor wrote just before his death: "The history of the world was played out in three days." Then quickly followed the First American Army, and St. Mihiel and the Meuse-Argonne.

Here is the story, written admirably by the one who should write it—a book that all Americans should read.

THOMAS G. FROTHINGHAM.

Rochester and Colgate: Historical Backgrounds of the Two Universities. By Jesse Leonard Rosenberger. (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1925, pp. vii, 173, \$1.60.) Mr. Rosenberger has utilized the seventy-fifth anniversary of the founding of both the University of Rochester and Rochester Theological Seminary by making a historical study of the controversy over the question of removing from Hamilton, New York, the college (Madison University) and the older theological seminary, now united by compact in what is known as Colgate University. His brief volume treats most specifically the establishment of the University of Rochester and touches only incidentally upon matters later than 1850. After one chapter setting forth the cultural interests of early Rochester and an attempt under Presbyterian auspices to establish a university there and another chapter outlining the history of the religious and educational activities of New York Baptists centring in Hamilton, the central

chapter takes up the Removal Project. This emphasizes the fact that the Hamilton institutions were the creation of the Baptists in the entire state, who thus were entitled to consider the question of the location of their educational institutions. Changes in the means of transportation, affecting the relative accessibility of Hamilton, and the dearth of higher education in the western part of the state combined to make a strong case for the advocates of removal. Our author does not keep entirely clear those phases of the plan which involved only the college and those which included the seminary as well, but they were doubtless confused in the controversy itself. He inclines to the view that the historic removal-project first arose in the resentful mind of Dr. Maginnis, in the summer of 1847; some would lay more stress upon the earlier discussion in Rochester of the question "whether the Baptists throughout the state would not concentrate their resources upon the establishment of a university in Rochester", a phrase of Dr. Pharcellus Church eight months after the incorporation of Madison University. This would involve the removal of the college at least.

WILLIAM H. ALLISON.

HISTORICAL NEWS

The office of this journal contains a few "separates" of almost every one of the articles published in the last fifteen years. The editor will gladly send any of these to their authors, on early application, and after November 1 to any member of the American Historical Association.

AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

The fortieth annual meeting of the American Historical Association will be held at Ann Arbor on December 28, 29, and 30. The official headquarters will be at the Michigan Union. The chairman of the Committee on Local Arrangements is Professor William A. Frayer of the University of Michigan. The chairman of the Programme Committee, Professor William E. Dodd, of the University of Chicago, has tentatively arranged for conferences, or for sessions embracing a group of papers, on the history of science, on ancient history, on medieval history, on the history of Tudor and Stuart England, on the problems of the Far East in recent years, on American colonial history, on problems of the American Revolution, on Spanish-American relations during the administration of John Quincy Adams, on problems of the Union during the Civil War, and on Canadian-American relations. The subjects of historical research in the colleges and of the study of history in high schools will be considered after somewhat the same manner as in previous years, and provision will be made for a special discussion of the problems and progress of the Association itself. The Agricultural History Society has arranged an attractive programme, and the Mississippi Valley Historical Association plans a subscription dinner, followed by a general session, in which papers are hoped for from Professor N. W. Stephenson and from Hon. Albert J. Beveridge. Fuller information respecting the programmes of these two societies will come later from their respective secretaries, Mr. Nils A. Olsen and Mrs. Clarence Paine. The programme for the American Historical Association's session on ancient history is in the hands of Professor A. E. Boak of Michigan, that of its session on Tudor and Stuart England in those of Dr. Conyers Read, while Professor W. K. Boyd, chairman of the committee on historical research in the colleges, will have charge of the programme on that subject, and Professor A. E. McKinley of that on high-school history.

The *Compte Rendu* of the Union Académique Internationale for last May's meeting shows especially gratifying progress in the work of the *Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum*, and in that of the cataloguing of manuscripts pertaining to alchemy. These reports, by the way, are always to

be found, annually, in the *Bulletin* of the Royal Academy of Belgium, class of letters.

An important enterprise of the Union Académique Internationale, in which the American Historical Association has its part, is that of the proposed dictionary of Medieval Latin of the period before the eleventh century. We have now received, from the international committee devoted to that subject, the first three numbers of its organ, *Bulletin Ducange: Archivum Latinitatis Medii Aevi* (Paris, Champion, 25 fr. per annum), in which the progress of the work is recounted. All the national committees have now completed the lists of writings (in general, those of their own countries) which they will plunder for citations, and many thousands of slips have already been accumulated. The list of the texts to be read by the American committee, under the chairmanship of Professor Beeson of Chicago, is in the third fascicle of the *Bulletin*.

THE ENDOWMENT FUND

The Committee on the Endowment Fund reports progress in certain directions, though not sufficiently advanced, for the most part, to make definite announcements possible at this time. The committee has met with an encouraging response to its appeals for co-operation by persons of national prominence, outside the academic circle, who recognize the claims of the Association to public support. A considerable number of such persons have already accepted membership in a "National Advisory Committee", now in process of formation. It has been thought best also to bring the subject once more before the whole Association at the Ann Arbor meeting.

Through the courtesy of the Committee on Programme, arrangements are being made for a "luncheon conference" at an hour which it is hoped will be kept clear of conflicting engagements and so make possible a general attendance. At this conference the responsibilities and resources of the Association will be considered in their relation to the need for a larger endowment. Among those who have agreed to speak are former Senator Albert J. Beveridge, Professor Guy S. Ford of the University of Minnesota, and Professor Arthur M. Schlesinger of Harvard University.

Professor Henry M. Wriston finds himself obliged, as a result of his recent election to the presidency of Lawrence College, to withdraw from his position as executive secretary of the committee. For the present, therefore, all correspondence should be with the office of the chairman, Professor Evarts B. Greene, 608A Kent Hall, Columbia University, New York City. The committee will be especially pleased to receive suggestions as to possible donors, or as to methods of procedure.

PERSONAL

Dr. Henry Jones Ford, president of the American Catholic Historical Association, and for some sixteen years a professor in Princeton Uni-

versity, died on August 29, at the age of seventy-four. His books on *The Rise and Growth of American Politics* (1898), on *The Scotch-Irish in America* (1915), and on *Washington and his Colleagues* (1918), have been extensively known.

Professor Norman M. Trenholme, of the University of Missouri, where he had been teaching since 1902, died on June 11, at the age of fifty. He was a man of learning, and of many agreeable traits.

Colonel Ralph E. Twitchell, vice-president of the New Mexico Historical Society, editor of the historical quarterly called *Old Santa Fé* and of the two official volumes of *Spanish Archives of New Mexico*, and author of *Leading Facts of New Mexican History* (1910), died on August 26, at the age of sixty-five.

Father J. Hungerford Pollen, S. J., author of *The English Catholics in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth* (1920) and editor of many documents illustrative of that field of history, and to whom the General of the Society of Jesus had entrusted the English history of that society, died on April 28, at the age of sixty-seven.

Dr. Arthur Chuquet, of the Collège de France, editor of the *Revue Critique d'Histoire et de Littérature*, died June 7, at the age of seventy-two. His most notable books were his eleven volumes on *Les Guerres de la Révolution* (1886-1896), and his three volumes on *La Jeunesse de Napoléon* (1897-1899).

John J. Gazley, hitherto instructor in Dartmouth College, has been made assistant professor of history there.

Dr. Frederick M. Cutler, professor of history in the University of Porto Rico, has been appointed professor of history in the Massachusetts State Normal College at Worcester.

Dr. Henry M. Wriston, professor of history in Wesleyan University, has resigned to become president of Lawrence College, Appleton, Wis.

Mrs. Dora N. Raymond, hitherto an instructor in Smith College, has been made assistant professor of history in Sweet Briar College, Virginia.

Professor James E. Walmsley, Winthrop College, Rock Hill, S. C., has accepted the chair of history and social sciences in the State Teachers College, Farmville, Virginia.

Professor K. C. Frazer of the University of North Carolina will have leave of absence for the present year, during which time he will take over the work of Mr. Bruce Williams of the University of Virginia.

In the Ohio State University Dr. Arthur H. Noyes has been promoted to an assistant professorship.

Professors A. L. Kohlmeier, Logan Esarey, and P. W. Townsend, of Indiana University, have been granted leave of absence for the present

academic year, and Professors A. T. Volwiler and J. D. Barnhard have been engaged for that period.

Dr. Louis M. Sears of Purdue University has been given the full rank of professor in that university.

Dr. V. Alton Moody of Albion College has been appointed assistant professor of history in the Iowa State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts, succeeding there Dr. H. C. Nixon, who has accepted an appointment as assistant professor of history in Vanderbilt University.

Dr. J. Lloyd Mechem, assistant professor in Washington University, St. Louis, is on leave for the academic year 1925-1926; he will act as associate professor of Hispanic-American history in the University of Texas while Professor Hackett is teaching at Harvard.

Dr. Frederick L. Nussbaum has been elected assistant professor of history in the University of Wyoming, Laramie.

Professor Basil Williams has resigned the headship of the department of history in McGill University, having been elected to the chair of history in the University of Edinburgh vacated by the retirement of Sir Richard Lodge.

GENERAL

The fourth annual interim Anglo-American Conference of Professors of History was held in London at the Institute of Historical Research on July 7, with an attendance of more than a hundred. Reports were presented on means for making more available for students the work of local historical and archaeological societies; on the editing of modern historical documents; and on other topics. Professor Samuel E. Morison, now terminating his period of service as Harmsworth professor of American history at Oxford, delivered an address on the Study of American History in England, and Sir Charles Firth spoke on the Writing of History. The senate of the University of London has resolved that a full conference of Anglo-American historians shall be held under its auspices in 1926, probably in the week beginning July 12.

The inauguration of the great *Histoire Générale* under the direction of Professor Gustave Glotz of the University of Paris is an event of the first scientific importance. The plan of this work comprises four sections, devoted respectively to ancient, medieval, modern, and contemporary history, and contemplates some fifty large octavo volumes, written by the foremost scholars of France. The ancient history section is divided into three parts, covering the Orient, Greece, and Rome; three volumes will be given to Greece, of which the first treats the period *Des Origines aux Guerres Médiques*, and is written by M. Glotz, the general editor. Of this, the first fascicle is now published (Paris, Presses Universitaires, 1925, pp. 200); each volume will consist of four fascicles.

Fascicles 9-19 of Maxime Petit's *Histoire Générale des Peuples* (Paris, Larousse, pp. 97-228) have now appeared, embracing summaries of the ancient and much of the medieval period, by MM. Baudrillart, Diehl, Huart, Calmette, Déprez, Bougier, and Farand.

Dr. Daniel C. Knowlton is the author of a volume entitled *Making History Graphic*, for which Otis W. Caldwell has furnished an introduction (Scribner).

Manuals such as E. Cavaignac's *Chronologie* (Paris, Payot, 1925, pp. 214) lighten the burdens of the student. There is a technical part, explaining systems and eras; the rest is a manual of dates in chronological order.

The *Bulletin* of the Institute of Historical Research connected with the University of London contains in its June issue the report of a committee on the editing of modern historical documents; a paper by Professor James F. Willard, of Colorado, on records dealing with the tax on movables, 1290-1350; and the conclusion of Dr. Biggar's useful account of the Public Archives of Canada.

A new (fourth) edition of the German version of Chantepie de la Saussaye's *Lehrbuch der Religionsgeschichte* is in progress, edited by Alfred Bertholet and Edvard Lehmann, aided by notable specialists. Several fascicles of both vol. I. and vol. II. have appeared (Tübingen, Mohr).

The *Mélanges Offerts à M. Gustave Schlumberger* on his eightieth birthday are in two volumes, the first dealing with *L'Histoire du Bas-Empire, de l'Empire Byzantin et de l'Orient Latin, la Philologie Byzantine*, the second with *La Numismatique, la Sigillographie, l'Archéologie* (Paris, Geuthner, 1924, pp. 578). Among others there are articles by the following noted scholars: N. Jorga, P. Batiffol, E. Cuq, C. Diehl, Th. Reinach, H. Delehaye, and H. Cordier.

The first thorough discussion of the monogram, once so important in coins, documentary seals, trade-marks, etc., is furnished by the learned expert in palaeography, Victor Gardthausen, in *Das Alte Monogramm* (Leipzig, Hiersemann, 1924, pp. xii, 188), with 398 reproductions, from Greek examples of the early fifth century B.C. up to the end of the Middle Ages.

The *Proceedings* (XXXIV. 1) of the American Antiquarian Society at the semi-annual meeting of April, 1924, includes an authoritative paper on the Founding of New Amsterdam in 1626, by Victor H. Paltsits; a paper by Dr. William MacDonald entitled *Do we Learn from History?*; and the Rhode Island section of Mr. Brigham's bibliography of American newspapers.

The July number of the *Catholic Historical Review* has an account of the Norse Church in Medieval America (Greenland) by Rev. Carl H. Meinberg, of St. Ambrose College; a timely article by Benjamin Tuska, New York lawyer, on Know-Nothingism in Baltimore, 1854-1860; and a discussion of the Fundamental Causes of the Decline of Spain, by Dr. Francis J. Tschann, of Pittsburgh.

In the July number of the *Journal of Negro History* Justice W. R. Riddell summarizes the *Code Noir* of 1770, and Mr. E. D. Johnson gives an account of Mrs. Behn's *Oroonoko*; but the main portion (pp. 245) of the contents is a body of letters written by negroes to anti-slavery workers and agencies, reprinted from the *Liberator* of 1831-1857 to show the point of view or state of mind of a multitude of negroes during that period.

A new international journal, which is to make its first appearance this autumn, is the *Zeitschrift für Ortsnamenforschung*, to be edited by Dr. Joseph Schnetz of Munich and published there by R. Oldenbourg. Intended to advance the study of place-names on the basis of strictly scientific principles, the journal will extend its scope to include place-names of whatever Indo-Germanic origin. Articles will appear in German, English, or French. Three numbers are to appear each year, at the price of 4.50 marks each.

Following the practice instituted a year ago, the *English Historical Review* publishes, in some twenty pages of its July number, a list, briefly annotated, of the most important historical articles in periodicals of the year intervening.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: C. Barbagallo, *Che Cosa è il Materialismo Storico*, concl. (*Nuova Rivista Storica*, January); Carlo Rostan, *Due Concezioni di Storia Universale*; Orosio e Bossuet (*ibid.*, March-June).

ANCIENT HISTORY

General review: Maurice Besnier, *Chronique d'Histoire Ancienne Grecque et Romaine* (*Revue des Questions Historiques*, July).

Beihefte zum Alten Orient indicates sufficiently in its title the purpose of a new series of publications under the editorship of Professor Wilhelm Schubart of Berlin; in the first number, August Köster treats with authority *Schiffahrt und Handelsverkehr des Oestlichen Mittelmeers im 3. und 2. Jahrtausend v. Chr.* (Leipzig, Hinrich, 1924).

A new critical monthly journal of classical knowledge, called *Gnomon*, is being published by Weidmann under the direction of a staff of distinguished scholars; the first issue is that of April, 1925. *Die Antike: Zeitschrift für Kunst und Kultur des Klassischen Altertums*, edited by Werner Jaeger (Berlin, de Gruyter), is a quarterly, addressed to a somewhat larger audience.

The latest volume in Henri Berr's *Bibliothèque de Synthèse Historique* is contributed by Clément Huart, professor at the École des Langues Orientales Vivantes and well-known master of Persian studies, who writes of *La Perse Antique et la Civilisation Iranienne* (Paris, Renaissance du Livre, 1925, pp. 310).

Recent historical issues of the *Loeb Classical Library* embrace vol. II. of the *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, vol. IV. of Polybius, and Xenophon, *Scripta Minora*.

Based on an extensive personal knowledge of recent excavations, Armin von Gerkan's *Griechische Städtanlagen* (Berlin, de Gruyter, 1924) furnishes the best recent reconstruction of the typical ancient city's building plan.

In a Utrecht doctoral dissertation entitled *Πενία εν Πλοῦτος* Dr. Jacob Hemelrijk discusses in chronological order the data that may be obtained from classical Greek writers on riches and poverty, their respective effects on individual mind and character and on society, and the mutual relations of the rich and the poor.

Der Agrarstaat in Platons Gesetzen, by Josef Bisinger, and *Die Auswärtige Bevölkerung im Ptolemäerreich*, by Fritz Heichelheim, constitute Beiheft XVII. and Beiheft XVIII. respectively of *Klio*.

Dr. Rhys Carpenter's *The Greeks in Spain*, a readable account of a fascinating subject, is one of the *Bryn Mawr College Monographs*, published by the college and by Messrs. Longmans.

The importance of numismatics for history is well illustrated by an able synthesis of the material scattered in the more recent catalogues, entitled *Die Alexandrinischen Münzen; Grundlegung einer Alexandrinischen Kaisergeschichte*, by Joseph Vogt (Stuttgart, Kohlhammer, 1924, 2 vols.).

An excellent semi-popular history of Italy up to the Punic Wars has been written by Professor Ettore Pais, the learned author of the *Storia Critica di Roma* and of *Ricerche sulla Storia e sul Diritto Pubblico di Roma*, under the title *Storia dell' Italia Antica* (Rome, Casa Editrice Optima, 1925, 2 vols., pp. xvi, 144, 558); it is to be continued up to the founding of the Empire by Augustus.

Volume III. of the *Papers and Monographs* of the American Academy in Rome is a treatise on *Roman Buildings of the Republic: an Attempt to Date them from their Materials* (Rome, the Academy, 1924, pp. 149), by Professor Tenney Frank, of the Johns Hopkins University. Volume IV. is a study in the early iron age of Latium and Etruria, entitled *Italic Hut Urns and Hut Urn Cemeteries* (*ibid.*, 1925, pp. 204, plates), by Mr. Walter R. Bryan, of Columbia University, amplest in respect to the hut urns of the Alban Hills, Rome, and Vetulonia.

During the last thirty years a great advance has been made in our knowledge of Bavaria under the Romans. This knowledge is conveniently summarized in *Die Römer in Bayern*, by Friedrich Wagner (Munich, Knorr, 1924, second ed., pp. 107).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Édouard Cuq, *L'Exploitation du Domaine Royal au Temps de Hammurapi* (Journal des Savants, March); Fritz Schachermeyr, *Zu Geschichte und Staatsrecht der Frühen Diadochenzeit* (Klio, XIX. 4); Hans Volkmann, *Demetrios I. und Alexander I. von Syrien* (*ibid.*); Walther Judeich, *König Pyrrhos' Römische Politik* (*ibid.*, XX. 1); David B. Smith, *Roman Law and Political Theory* (Scottish Historical Review, July); Ettore Pais, *La Prima Guerra Punica*, I. (Rassegna Italiana, April); Reinhold Rau, *Zur Geschichte des Pannonisch-Dalmatischen Krieges der Jahre 6-9 A.D.* (Klio, XIX. 3); Hans Drexler, *Untersuchungen zu Iosephus und zur Geschichte des Jüdischen Aufstandes*, 66-70 (*ibid.*).

EARLY CHURCH HISTORY

Professor K. Müller of Tübingen has completely revised his *Kirchengeschichte*, which first appeared in 1892 in the *Grundriss der Theologischen Wissenschaften*; the first fascicle of the first volume is published at Tübingen by Mohr (1924, pp. xii, 316).

A volume edited by H. I. Bell, entitled, *Jews and Christians in Egypt: the Jewish Troubles in Alexandria, and the Athanasian Controversy, illustrated by Texts from Greek Papyri in the British Museum* (London, British Museum), has for the most notable item in its contents the text of a rescript of the emperor Claudius, addressed to the people of Alexandria soon after his accession, and casting light on the position of the Jews in that city.

A study of *The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy*, by Rev. W. O. E. Oesterley, is published by the Oxford University Press.

Vol. I. of *The Sacramentary (Liber Sacramentorum): Historical and Liturgical Notes on the Roman Missal* (London, Burns and Oates), translated from the Italian of the Abate Ildefonso Schuster, presents a general history of the greater part of the Roman liturgy, prepared with great learning and care.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Chr. A. Bugge, *Das Problem der Ältesten Kirchenverfassung* (Skrifter utgit av Videnskapselskapet i Kristiania, 1924, II., Hist.-Fil. Kl.); A. Mingana, *The Early Spread of Christianity in Central Asia and the Far East: a New Document* (Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, July); Rev. Hippolyte Delehay, S. J., *Les Recueils Antiques [IV.-VII. cent.] de Miracles des Saints*, I. (Analecta Bollandiana, XLIII. 1-2).

MEDIEVAL HISTORY

Though written with the enthusiasm of a semi-popular lecture course, *La Mecque à la Veille de l'Hégire* by P. H. Lammens, S. J. (Beirut, Impr. Catholique, 1924, pp. 343), is based on an extensive knowledge of Arabian manuscript literature and throws new light on the commercial position of the city.

The first volume of the review *Byzantion* is a handsome large octavo (pp. viii, 755), of irreproachable typography, abundantly illustrated and notable alike for the number and importance of its articles, the value of its reviews, and the interest of its bulletins. All branches of Byzantine studies find place in this journal, which fully realizes the hopes expressed at the Brussels Congress of 1923. The directing committee is composed of MM. Diehl, Jorga, Millet, and Sir W. Ramsay; the secretariat for two years will be served by MM. P. Graindor and H. Grégoire.

An attractive introduction to missionary life in the early Middle Ages can be had from Mr. Edward Kylie's *The English Correspondence of Saint Boniface* (London, Chatto and Windus, 1924, pp. xiv, 212), no. 19 in *The Medieval Library*.

Mr. Henry Bett has written, and the Cambridge University Press is publishing, *John Scotus Erigena*, a thoroughgoing study of the life and writings of that philosopher and of his position in the history of medieval philosophy.

A recent sympathetic study of scholasticism is provided by Alois Dempf's *Die Hauptform Mittelalterlicher Weltanschauung: eine Geisteswissenschaftliche Studie über die Summa* (Munich, Oldenbourg, 1925, pp. 180).

A book on *The Medieval Village*, by Dr. G. G. Coulton, is announced by the Cambridge University Press.

The first part of tom. IV. of the *Biblioteca Bio-bibliografica della Terra Santa e dell' Oriente Franciscano* of Father G. Golubovich, O.F.M. (Quaracchi, 1923, pp. 503), is concerned with documents on the present rights or claims of the Franciscans in Jerusalem. The main portion gives documents for the period 1333-1345 in Franciscan, but also in Armenian, Cypriote, and much other Oriental history.

Dr. Johannes Nohl's *Der Schwarze Tod; eine Chronik der Pest* (Potsdam, G. Kiepenheuer) treats of the whole history of that pestilence, in all its aspects and consequences, and has interesting illustrations, especially reproductions of dance-of-Death woodcuts.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: George Gordon, *Medium Aevum and the Middle Age* (Society for Pure English, tract XIX.); E. Schramm, *Neun Briefe des Byzantinischen Gesandten Leo von seiner Reise zu Otto III. aus den Jahren 997-998* (Byzantinische Zeitschrift, XXV. 1-2);

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXXI.—13.

Hamilton Thompson, *Cathedral Builders of the Middle Ages* (History, July); Dr. Walter Seton, *The Stigmatization of St. Francis of Assisi* (Hibbert Journal, July).

MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

Messrs. Harrap of London have published a volume of essays or lectures, by excellent hands, *The Social and Political Ideas of some Great Thinkers of the Renaissance and the Reformation*, edited by Professor F. J. C. Hearnshaw; it embraces Nicolas of Cusa, Sir John Fortescue, Machiavelli, More, Erasmus, Luther, and Calvin.

What bids fair to be an important contribution to diplomatic history is the Vicomte de Guichen's *Les Grandes Questions Européennes et la Diplomatie des Puissances sous la Seconde République Française*, vol. I. of which covers the period from October, 1847, to May, 1850 (Paris, Attinger, 1925, pp. 550).

A technically skillful defense of the German military occupation after the Franco-Prussian War is offered by Karl Linnebach, a former official, in *Deutschland als Sieger im Besetzten Frankreich, 1871-1873; auf Grund der Deutschen Akten dargestellt* (Stuttgart, Deutsche Verlagsanstalt, 1924, pp. 200). Hans Herzfeld's *Deutschland und das Geschlagene Frankreich, 1871-1873* (Berlin, Deutsche Verlagsgesellschaft für Politik und Geschichte, 1924, pp. 300), is a similar study on a somewhat broader political basis.

The British Institute of International Affairs follows Mr. Temperley's *History of the Peace Conference of Paris* with a *Survey of International Affairs, 1920-1924*, by Arnold J. Toynbee, and with a volume on *The World after the Peace Conference*, both published recently, and intends thereafter to publish an annual series of which the first volume, *Survey of International Affairs for 1924*, is expected to appear this autumn.

Aristarco Fasulo's *Il Primato Papale nella Storia e nel Pensiero Italiano* (Rome, Bilychnis, 1924, pp. 240) is said to be a work of merit, especially in its synthesis of the problem of conciliation between Church and State in the last decades of the nineteenth and the first of the twentieth centuries.

Extraterritoriality: its Rise and Decline, by Shih Shun Liu, is a recent number of the *Columbia University Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law* (Longmans).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Karl Brandi, *Renaissance und Reformation* (Preussische Jahrbücher, May); Henri Sée, *Le Grand Commerce Maritime et le Système Colonial, dans leurs Relations avec l'Évolution du Capitalisme, du XVI^e au XIX^e Siècle* (Revue de Synthèse Historique, XXXIX.); Ch. Bastide, *Un Secrétaire d'Ambassade Anglais à*

Paris sous Louis XIV. (Revue des Sciences Politiques, April-June); P. Matter, *Les Conventions Franco-Sardes des 26-28 Janvier 1859* (*ibid.*); Luigi Rava, *L'Imperatrice Eugenia, Felice Orsini, il Dottore Conneau, e L. C. Farini* (Rivista d'Italia, April 15); Kurt Rheindorf, *Die Englisch-Deutschen Verhandlungen über eine Abrüstung im Frühjahr 1870* (Archiv für Politik und Geschichte, May); G. Salvemini, *Alla Vigilia del Congresso di Berlino; il Colloquio Crispi-Andrássy 21 Ottobre 1877 e la Genuinità dei "Diari" Crispini, con Documenti Inediti* (Nuova Rivista Storica, January); J. B. Manger, *Russia and the Balkan Alliance, II.* (Mededeelingen van het Nederlandsche Comité tot Onderzoek van de Oorzaken van den Wereldoorlog, April-May); E. Vandervelde, *Ten Years of Socialism in Europe* (Foreign Affairs, July).

THE WORLD WAR

The latest additions to the Carnegie Endowment's *Economic and Social History of the World War* in the French series are *L'Agriculture pendant la Guerre*, by Michel Augé-Laribé, secretary general of the Confédération Nationale des Associations Agricoles (Paris, Presses Universitaires, 1925, pp. xii, 332); *Lyon pendant la Guerre*, by Édouard Herriot, recently prime minister of France (*ibid.*, pp. xvi, 100); and *Le Contrôle du Ravitaillement de la Population Civile*, by Pierre Pinot, maître des requêtes au Conseil d'État (*ibid.*, pp. xii, 320).

La Bataille de la Somme, 1^{er} Juillet 1916-1^{er} Janvier 1917 (Paris, Berger, 1925, pp. 416), constitutes vol. XI. of General Palat's *La Grande Guerre sur le Front Occidental*.

An important body of captured German military documents, including the war diary and archives of an army, is presented in French translation, with intelligent introduction and comments by two officers of the Historical Section of the French General Staff, in an important volume entitled *La Bataille des Flandres d'après le Journal de Marche et les Archives de la IV^e Armée Allemande, 9-30 Avril, 1918* (ed. Col. René Tournès and Capt. Henry Berthemet).

The rapidly growing literature on Russia's share in the responsibility for the World War receives two additions in *Der Beginn des Krieges 1914: Tagesaufzeichnungen des Ehemaligen Russischen Aussenministeriums*, with introduction by A. von Wegerer (Berlin, Deutsche Verlagsgesellschaft für Politik und Geschichte, 1924, pp. viii, 66), and *Russlands Eintritt in den Weltkrieg*, by Günther Frantz (*ibid.*, 1924, pp. xi, 306).

An accurate and readable account of the war between Italy and Austria is given in small compass by Captain Amedeo Tosti in *La Guerra Italo-Austriaca, 1915-1918* (Milan, Edizioni *Alpes*; 8 maps).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: T. G. Masaryk, *Reflections on the Question of War Guilt* (Foreign Affairs, July); J. Hashagen, *Method-*

ische Schwierigkeiten bei Behandlung der Vorgeschichte des Weltkriegs (Europäische Gespräche, June); Graf Max Montgelas, *Das Neue Buch Pierre Renouwins* (Die Kriegsschuldfrage, July); Dr. Boghitschewitsch, *Weitere Einzelheiten über das Attentat von Sarajewo* (ibid.); Karl Schwendemann, *Die Dokumente Iswolskis und die Kriegsschuldfrage* (Archiv für Politik und Geschichte, June); R. P. Oszwald, *Die Verletzung der Belgischen Neutralität* (Die Kriegsschuldfrage, July); Hans Hallmann, *Oberst House und Grossadmiral von Tirpitz* (ibid.); Wolfgang Windelband, *Der Amerikanische Vermittlungsversuch vom Mai 1914* (Archiv für Politik und Geschichte, May).

GREAT BRITAIN

General review: F. Cabrol, *Courrier Anglais; Angleterre et Amérique* (Revue des Questions Historiques, July).

Cambridge Legal Essays (W. Heffer and Sons), presented *honoris causa* to three distinguished teachers of law in that university, contains several good contributions to legal history: an essay by Professor H. D. Hazeltine on the Law School of Pavia and its Influence upon Roman Law, one by Professor H. C. Gutteridge on the Early History of the Notarial Profession in England, and one by Professor A. P. Higgins on Grotius. An edition of John Selden's *Ad Fletam Dissertatio*, reprinted from the edition of 1647 with parallel translation, introduction, and notes by Mr. David Ogg, is soon to be added to the series of *Cambridge Studies in English Legal History*. At a later date *A Manual of Year-Book Study*, by Dr. W. C. Bolland, will also appear in the series.

Two additional volumes (VI. and VII.) of the British Academy's series of *Records of the Social and Economic History of England and Wales* are in course of preparation, namely, *The Accounts of a Kentish Estate in the Seventeenth Century*, edited by Miss E. Lodge, principal of Westfield College, and *Records of the English Templars*, edited by Miss B. Lees.

The publisher G. Van Oest, of Paris and Brussels, announces a quarto volume of 100-150 pages of text and 100 heliotype plates on *La Miniature Anglaise du X^e au XIII^e Siècle*, by Mr. Eric G. Millar of the British Museum, reproducing 164 miniatures of the period indicated (280 fr.).

The student of borough customs will be grateful to the History of Exeter Research Group for the issue of *The Anglo-Norman Customal of Exeter* (Oxford University Press, pp. 60), edited for the first time by J. W. Schopp, and presenting text, translation, and four plates of fac-similes.

The Pipe Roll Society, which began in 1884 by publishing the Pipe Roll (Great Roll of the Exchequer) for 5 Henry II., and from that time to 1915 brought out one or two rolls annually, issuing in that last year,

as vol. XXXVII., that for 33 Henry II., has resumed publication in the present year, publishing, as vol. XXXVIII. (pp. xiii, 270), the roll for his thirty-fourth year. In this same year it begins, with vol. XXXIX., a new series, that volume being entitled *The Great Roll of the Pipe for the Second Year of the Reign of King Richard the First, Michaelmas 1190* (pp. xxv, 239). That for 1 Richard I. was published by the Master of the Rolls in 1844. The present volume is edited by Mrs. Doris M. Stenton, of University College, Reading. Mr. Charles Johnson contributes an explanatory preface. Both books have full indexes. The society desires more subscribers for its work of printing these important historical sources.

Lady Margaret (Oxford University Press, 1924, pp. 135), a memoir of Lady Margaret Beaufort, countess of Richmond and Derby, mother of Henry VII., was prepared by Miss E. M. G. Routh to be issued in aid of an appeal for funds for Lady Margaret Hall at Oxford. It rests on the preceding accounts by Bishop Fisher, C. H. Cooper, and others, rather than on any research in manuscripts, but shows careful study, is well written, and exhibits with skill and sympathy a character and life well deserving commemoration.

Messrs. Lane are about to publish a further collection of material from the ancient house of Fugger of Augsburg under the title *The Fugger News-Letters: Second Series*. This presents correspondence dealing exclusively with English affairs.

An important book, resting on thorough research, is Rev. Dr. A. F. Scott Pearson's *Thomas Cartwright and Elizabethan Puritanism, 1535-1603* (Cambridge University Press), in two volumes, including an appendix of documents.

Canon A. W. Goodman of Winchester, and the dean, Dr. W. H. Hutton, have co-operated in editing *The Statutes governing the Cathedral Church of Winchester*, given by Charles I. in 1638 at the instance of Archbishop Laud, and they have been printed, in Latin and in English translation, with some illustrative matter, in a handsome quarto volume (Clarendon Press, pp. xv, 131).

The Godfather of Downing Street: Sir George Downing, 1623-1684, by John Beresford, is published in London by Cobden-Sanderson.

A Life of the Reverend Richard Baxter (1615-1691), the non-conformist divine, by Frederick J. Powicke, is published by Houghton Mifflin Company.

A second volume of *Culloden Papers*, edited by Duncan Warrand, and containing, among other papers illustrative of the history of the Highlands in the eighteenth century, the letters of Simon, Lord Lovat, has just been published by the Scottish History Society.

The University of Manchester has brought out a new and cheaper edition of the late Lieut. Mark Hovell's *The Chartist Movement*, of which the original edition was reviewed in this journal in 1918 (XXIV. 90). This excellent history of Chartism has been widely popularized by the Workers' Educational Association. In editing the revised edition Professor Tout has been enabled "to define, if possible, more precisely the homes and status of some of the minor actors of Hovell's drama".

Beiheft 3 of the *Historische Zeitschrift* consists in a study by Hans Precht of *Englands Stellung zur Deutschen Einheit, 1848-1850* (Munich, Oldenbourg, 1925, pp. 192).

Messrs. Longmans will publish during the autumn *The Later Correspondence of Lord John Russell, 1840-1878*, edited by Dr. G. P. Gooch, in two volumes, continuing the earlier correspondence edited by the late Hon. Rollo Russell and published in 1913.

The Jewish Publishing Society of America has brought out a life of *Moses Montefiore*; by Paul Goodman.

Viscount Grey of Fallodon, foreign secretary from 1905 to 1916, is to publish a volume of recollections and observations of public life entitled *Twenty-five Years, 1892-1916*.

The Life of Sir William Osler, in two volumes, by Harvey Cushing, is brought out by the Oxford University Press.

John Alfred Spender has produced two volumes of sketches of British statesmen, with a review of the development of English politics and its ethics, which bear the title *The Public Life*.

The Lincoln Record Society (which would be glad to have more membership subscriptions from America—a guinea a year) has in the press the *Register of Richard Gravesend*, bishop of Lincoln, 1258-1279, ed. Rev. F. M. Davis; a volume of documents illustrating the state of the Church in that extensive diocese *temp.* Elizabeth and James I., ed. Canon C. W. Foster; *The Earliest Lincolnshire Assize Rolls, temp.* John, ed. Mrs. Stenton; and a volume of *Visitations of Religious Houses*, continuing previous volumes from 1450, ed. A. H. Thompson. The society also intends to publish, in four volumes, the large collection of original charters belonging to the dean and chapter of Lincoln Cathedral.

Mr. L. R. W. Loyd's *Lundy: its History and Natural History* (Longmans) presents, along with much descriptive matter, what is known of the history of the island.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: W. H. Prior, *Notes on the Weights and Measures of Medieval England* (Bulletin Ducange, 1924, 2, 3); W. C. Bolland, *The Book of Assizes [1327-1377]* (Cambridge Law Journal, II., no. 11); E. Hughes, *The English Monopoly of Salt in the Years 1563-1571* (English Historical Review, July); Miss G. Scott

Thomson, *The Bishops of Durham and the Office of Lord Lieutenant in the Seventeenth Century* (*ibid.*); H. Dodwell, *Warren Hastings and the Assignment of the Carnatic* (*ibid.*).

IRELAND AND THE DOMINIONS

(For Canada, see p. 215; for India, see p. 205.)

Mr. St. John Ervine's *Parnell* (London, Benn) makes a remarkable addition to Professor Basil Williams's series of *Makers of the Nineteenth Century*.

FRANCE

General review: N. Karéiev, *Les Derniers Travaux des Historiens Russes sur la Révolution Française, 1912-1924* (*Annales Historiques de la Révolution Française*, May).

An admirable reconstruction of the history of the kingdom of Arles, with reference particularly to the influence upon it of general European politics in the late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, forms the content of *Das Arelat in der Europäischen Politik von der Mitte des 10. bis zum Aufgange des 14. Jahrhunderts*, a Jena doctoral dissertation by Rudolf Grieser (Jena, Fromman, 1925, pp. viii, 71).

The Société de l'Histoire de France has published vol. II. of the *Mémoires du Maréchal de Florange, dit le Jeune Aventureux*, edited by Robert Goubaux and André Lemoisne (Paris, Champion, 1924; pp. xxxii, 336); the volume, which concludes the memoirs, covers the years 1521 to 1525, together with tables, notices of the author and of the existing manuscripts.

An *Histoire de la Peinture Française*, in five volumes, by Drs. Louis Dimier and Louis Réau, is announced by G. Van Oest of Paris and Brussels. One volume will be devoted to the Middle Ages, two to the seventeenth century, and two to the eighteenth. The volumes will be handsome quartos, each of 100-120 pages of text and 64 heliogravure plates, reproducing more than 400 *chefs-d'œuvre* of French painting from 1300 to 1790.

M. Wladimir d'Ormesson's *Portraits d'Hier et d'Aujourd'hui* (Paris, Champion, pp. 267) contains essays on Olivier d'Ormesson and the trial of Fouquet, on Vergennes and Delcassé, on St. Francis de Paul at the court of France, on the Vicomte E.-M. de Vogüé, and on the letters of Marshal Lyautey.

No popular edition of the works of the Comte de Saint-Simon exists, nor is there a satisfactory critical edition. To mark the centenary of the great Utopian's death, Professor C. Bouglé has published a skillfully selected series of extracts, which give a sufficient idea of his principal theories; the title is *L'Oeuvre d'Henri de Saint-Simon; Textes Choisis* (Paris, Alcan, 1925, pp. xxxii, 264).

In a series of little books intended for the intelligent general reader (Paris, Armand Colin) Professor Gaëtan Pirou of Bordeaux presents a clear and readable account of *Les Doctrines Économiques en France depuis 1870* (pp. 204), socialistic, individualistic, and intermediate.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Otto Cartellieri, *Die Ritterliche Gesellschaft am Burgundischen Hofe* (Historische Zeitschrift, CXXXII. 1); J. Carabin, *La France et la Corse dans l'Histoire* (Nouvelle Revue, May 15); Paul Viard, *De Quelques Incidences de l'Histoire Politique sur le Droit Privé de 1789 à 1830* (Annales Historiques de la Révolution Française, July-August); Albert Mathiez, *La Révolution et les Subsistances; la Répression de l'Accaparement en l'An II.* (*ibid.*, May); P. Sainte-Claire Deville and Théodore Reinach, *Un Faux Historique; la Séance Secrète du Directoire du 9 Floréal An IV. et le "Mémoire Justificatif" de Barras* (Revue Historique, July); Ph. Sagnac, *L'Avènement de Bonaparte à l'Empire; le Consulat à Vie*, concl. (Napoléon, May); Mario Belgrano, *Napoléon et l'Argentine: la Mission de Sassenay, 1808* (*ibid.*); J. Dontenville, *La Catastrophe du Duc d'Enghien* (*ibid.*, July); L. de Contenson, *Lamartine, Secrétaire de Légation: son Mémoire de Concours en 1826* (Revue d'Histoire Diplomatique, XXXIX. 3); A. Maréchal, *Souvenirs et Impressions du Blocus de Metz, 1870*, I. (Nouvelle Revue, July 1); J. M. Carré, *Michelet et la Guerre de 1870, d'après des Documents Inédits* (Mercure de France, May 15); Duc de Broglie, *Mémoires*, VII., VIII. (Revue des Deux Mondes, May 15, June 1).

ITALY, SPAIN, AND PORTUGAL

General reviews: Cizam, *Courrier Italien* (Revue des Questions Historiques, July); Federico Chabod, *Di Alcuni Studi Recenti sull' Età Comunale e Signorile nell' Italia Settentrionale* (Rivista Storica Italiana, January-April).

Il Contributo dell' Italia alla Riforma Religiosa in Europa, by Piero Chiminelli (Rome, Bilychnis, 1924, pp. xi, 219), no. 16 of the *Biblioteca di Studi Religiosi*, examines the influence of early Italian heresies, of the Renaissance and of Socinianism, and studies the contacts of northern reformers with Italy.

Aldo Ferrari attempts a synthesis of the period of the French Revolution in Italy in his *L'Esplosione Rivoluzionaria del Risorgimento Italiano, 1789-1815* (Milan, 1924). It carries forward the survey begun in his *La Preparazione Intellettuale del Risorgimento Italiano*, which covers the period 1748-1789.

The *Atti dell' XI. Congresso della Società Nazionale per la Storia del Risorgimento Italiano* (meeting at Milan, September 17-19, 1923), only just published, contains the following papers: Adriano Alberti, "L'Armistizio di Villa Giusti", which will be part of the author's forth-

coming work on *L'Italia e il Fine della Guerra: Vittorio Veneto, Villa Giusti*; G. Vittani, "Il Popolo di Milano dalla Battaglia di Novara alla Resa di Venezia (lettere di un confidente)".

The active and efficient Società Storica Subalpina has published a collaborative work on an important phase of the Risorgimento, *La Rivoluzione Piemontese del 1821* (Turin, 1925).

The centenary anniversary of the death of Santorre di Santarosa, patriotic hero of the Piedmontese revolution of 1821, who afterwards gave his life for the liberty of Greece, has called forth a biography by E. Ceresole, *Santorre De' Rossi di Santarosa nel Primo Centenario della Morte, con Documenti Inediti e Illustrazioni* (Athens, 1925).

The volumes containing the acts of the Neapolitan parliament that existed from October, 1820, until March, 1821, edited by Annibale Alberti, a part of the monumental series of *Atti delle Assemblee Costituzionali Italiane dal Medio Evo al 1831*, published by the Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, are about to appear.

The distinguished scholar and archivist A. Luzio has brought to light still more material for a life of Carlo Alberto in *Le Lettere di Carlo Alberto al Cav. Luigi Bianco di Barbania* (Turin, 1924).

Lettere Famigliari, con Ricordi degli Ultimi Anni Suoi, of F. D. Guerrazzi, edited by Gian Francesco Guerrazzi (Rome, 1924), is the first publication in which use is made of the family archives of the Tuscan author and agitator.

The second volume of Paul Matter's *Cavour et l'Unité Italienne* has been published at Paris by Alcan. It has been favorably received in Italy as representing a closer study of the available information than the first volume, and also as bringing to the subject a valuable positive contribution from the French archives, especially for the period from 1848 to the outbreak of the Crimean War.

After the diaries and personal narratives come the technical studies of military operations. To this class belong F. Sardagna's *Il Disegno di Guerra Italiano* (Turin, Gobetti, 1924) and General A. Alberti's *Infondati Giudizi Stranieri sulla Nostra Guerra* (Rome, Stabilimento Poligrafico, 1924).

In the fourth series of A. Morel-Fatio's learned *Etudes sur l'Espagne* (Paris, Champion, pp. 491), the essays of most historical importance are on the grant of the dukedom of Molina to Bertrand du Guesclin, on Germans in Spain and Spaniards in Germany, and on the life and works of Bernardino de Mendoza.

The Centro de Estudios Americanistas de Sevilla has published the second volume of the second series of Don Pedro Torres Lanzas's calendar, *Independencia de América: Fuentes para su Studio*, listing and de-

scribing some 900 documents of 1816–1820; and a succinct account of *Los Archivos de la República Argentina*, by Señor José Revello de Torre.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: F. Chabod, *Del "Principe" di Niccolò Macchiavelli*, I., II. (Nuova Rivista Storica, January, March); Gioacchino Volpe, *Italia e Savoia* (Nuova Antologia, June 1); Annibale Alberti, *Il Programma dell' Unificazione Italiana nella Rivoluzione Napoletana del 1820* (*ibid.*, July 1); Alcide Ebray, *Il Preteso "Tradimento" dell' Italia* (Rivista d'Italia, March 15); A. Luzio, *A Proposito di un Libro Straniero sulla Storia del Risorgimento* (Rivista Storica Italiana, January–April); Pio Calza, *Gli Insegnamenti della Guerra del 1866* (Rassegna Italiana, May); G. Salvemini, *La Politica Estera della Destra, 1871–1876*, concl. (Rivista d'Italia, January 15, February 15); Gennaro Mondaini, *Un Profilo dell' Ultimo Trentennio di Vita Politica Italiana* (Nuova Rivista Storica, March–June); Ludwig Stein, *Geschichte und Wesen der Italienischen Presse*, I., concl. (Preussische Jahrbücher, May, June); Fr. Rousseau, *Le Merveilleux en Espagne au XVI^e et au XVII^e Siècles* (Revue des Questions Historiques, July).

GERMANY, CZECHOSLOVAKIA, AUSTRIA, AND SWITZERLAND

General review: Joseph Šusta, *Histoire de Tchécoslovaquie* [publications, 1904–1924] (Revue Historique, July).

The exhaustive *Étude sur l'Influence Musicale de l'Abbaye de Saint-Gall, VIII^e au XI^e Siècle*, which Dom Rambaut van Doren has presented as his doctoral dissertation at the University of Louvain (Louvain, Librairie Universitaire, 1925, pp. 157), concludes that the traditional early importance of this monastery in musical matters is unfounded.

An admirable monograph by Dietrich Rohmer, *Vom Werdegang Friedrichs des Grossen; die Politische Entwicklung des Kronprinzen* (Greifswald, Bamberg, 1924, pp. 132), is a product of Glagau's seminar.

Rich material for the history of the German National Assembly of 1848–1849 will be found in *Aktenstücke und Aufzeichnungen zur Geschichte der Frankfurter Nationalversammlung*, edited by Rudolf Hübner from the papers of Johann Gustav Droysen, the great Hellenist (Stuttgart, Deutsche Verlagsanstalt, 1924, pp. 848); the publication is vol. XIV. of *Deutsche Geschichtsquellen des 19. Jahrhunderts*, issued by the Bavarian Academy of Sciences. In the same series, the historian of German socialism will find a rich harvest in the six volumes of Ferdinand Lassalle's *Nachgelassene Briefe und Schriften*, edited by Gustav Mayer.

Bismarcks Sturz und die Parteien, by Wilhelm Mommsen (Stuttgart, Deutsche Verlagsanstalt, 1924, pp. 206), is an able study of the intricacies of German party politics.

Theodor Plaut's *Deutsche Handelspolitik: ihre Geschichte, Ziele, und Mittel* (Leipzig, Teubner, 1924, pp. 246) is a group of interesting lectures, especially useful for the post-war period.

Various contributors, under the editorial care of Professor Aloys Schulte, have combined to prepare an interesting volume entitled *Tausend Jahre Deutscher Geschichte und Deutscher Kultur am Rhein* (Düsseldorf, L. Schwann), in which the history of the Rhine and its valley in a great variety of aspects is recounted.

The second and concluding volume of J. Gebauer's handsome illustrated *Geschichte der Stadt Hildesheim*, told for the general public, but with scholarly thoroughness, brings the story of that ancient city from 1553 to the present (Hildesheim, Lax, 1924, pp. 529).

Vol. II. of Victor Bibl's ambitious effort, *Der Zerfall Oesterreichs*, presents the years *Von Revolution zu Revolution, 1848-1918* (Vienna, Ricola, 1924, pp. 577).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Carl Brinkmann, *Der Rhein als Verkehrsader* (Zeitschrift für die Gesamte Staatswissenschaft, LXXIX. 2); Karl Beer, *Zur Ueberlieferung der Sogenannten Reformation Kaiser Siegmunds* (Mitteilungen des Oesterreichischen Instituts für Geschichtsforschung, XL. 3); Paul Kalkoff, *Friedrich der Weise und Luther* (Historische Zeitschrift, CXXXII. 1); Joachim Müller, *Die Politik Kaiser Karls V. am Trienter Konzil im Jahre 1545* (Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, XLIV. 2); Johannes Müller, *Die Entstehung der Reichsexekutionsordnung vom Jahre 1555* (Mitteilungen des Oesterreichischen Instituts für Geschichtsforschung, XL. 3); H. Ulmann, *Briefe aus Preussens Franzosenzeit, 1806-1815* (Historische Zeitschrift, CXXXII. 1); Hermann Aubin, *Scharnhorst* (Deutsche Rundschau, June); B. Schwertfeger, *Die Vierte Reihe der Diplomatischen Akten des Auswärtigen Amtes, II.* (Archiv für Politik und Geschichte, June); W. Andreas, *Kiderlen-Wächter, Randglossen zu seinem Nachlass* (Historische Zeitschrift, CXXXII. 2); Otto Korfes and Wilhelm Dieckmann, *Die Weltwirtschaftliche Abhängigkeit Deutschlands vor dem Kriege* (Archiv für Politik und Geschichte, July); Otto Hammann, *Aufzeichnungen* (*ibid.*, June); Vizeadmiral-a.-D. Hopman, *Zur Deutschen Flottenpolitik*; Hans Delbrück, *Erwiderung* (Die Kriegsschuldfrage, August).

NETHERLANDS AND BELGIUM

In 1871 the Historisch Genootschap of Utrecht published some of the papers of Cornelis Pietersz. Hooft, burgomaster of Amsterdam and father of the poet Pieter C. Hooft, but the selection was chiefly of political pieces and somewhat arbitrary. The society has now brought out what is called a second volume of the *Memoriën en Adviezen van Cornelis Pietersz. Hooft* (pp. xxxv, 479), embracing some fifteen additional addresses or groups of documents or notes, illustrating in varied ways the mental life or course of public opinion of Holland in the years from 1584 to 1619. The editor, Dr. H. A. Enno van Gelder, supplies excellent introductions and comments.

In Deel XLVI. of the *Bijdragen en Mededeelingen* of the same society Dr. van Gelder presents some more C. P. Hooft material, notes on the budgets of 1601 and 1602; and there are interesting documents concerning the Lord of Lumey's (William de la Marck's) expedition against Amsterdam in 1572, and curious inventories of burghers and peasants of Franeker about 1550. But that which will most interest American readers is the diary of Hendrik Haecxs, member of the supreme council of Dutch Brazil, 1645-1654, from which, and from the introduction by Mr. S. P. L'Honoré Naber, much help toward understanding of West India Company history may be had.

The misfortune of Holland, forced into war against its will, is competently studied by Professor Francis P. Renaut in *Les Provinces-Unies et la Guerre d'Amérique, 1775-1785*, vol. I., *De la Neutralité à la Belligérance, 1775-1780* (Paris, Graouli, 1925, pp. 430).

NORTHERN AND EASTERN EUROPE

General review: Marcel Handelsman, *Les Études d'Histoire Polonaise et les Tendances Actuelles de la Pensée Historique en Pologne* (Revue de Synthèse Historique, XXXIX.).

Professor M. G. Schybergson's *Politische Geschichte Finnlands, 1809-1919*, in the series of *Allgemeine Staatengeschichte* (Stuttgart, Perthes, 1925, pp. 500) is by a scholar of the highest authority. It is especially full for the years since 1905.

La Pologne au V^e Congrès International des Sciences Historiques, Bruxelles, 1923 (Warsaw, Institut Mianowski, 1924, pp. viii, 269), contains the text or an analysis of the papers and communications read by Polish scholars at that congress.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Karl Stählin, *Russland und Europa* (Historische Zeitschrift, CXXXII. 2).

SOUTHEASTERN EUROPE

Messrs. Fisher Unwin of London announce *A History of the Roumanian People*, by the veteran Rumanian historian Professor N. Jorga of the University of Bucharest.

Bulgarien unter der Türkenherrschaft is a newly published study by Dr. Alois Hajek, privatdozent for East European history in the University of Vienna (Stuttgart, Deutsche Verlagsanstalt, 1925, pp. 335).

Les Presses Universitaires have published the third volume of Michel Lhéritier's *Histoire Diplomatique de la Grèce de 1820 à Nos Jours*; this volume deals with *Le Règne de Georges I^{er}* (Paris, 1925, pp. xxvi, 516).

ASIA, MEDIEVAL AND MODERN

The firm of Longmans has brought out *A Sketch of the History of India from 1858 to 1918*, by Henry Dodwell.

An impressive series of 250-odd biographical records of men who had their part in the building of an empire is contained in *Records of Clan Campbell in the Military Service of the Honourable East India Company* (Longmans, pp. lxxxv, 311), compiled by Major Sir Duncan Campbell of Barcaldine, Bart. A preface by Lt.-Col. Sir Richard Temple, Bart., relates in a more connected narrative form the history of the Company's army and of the honorable part played in it by the Campbells.

The German ethnologist Dr. Georg Friederici's translation of Alvaro de Mendaña's account of his discovery of the Solomon Islands, *Alvaro de Mendaña, Die Entdeckung der Inseln des Salomo* (Stuttgart, Strecker and Schröder, 1925, pp. xi, 209), adds to what is already familiar to English readers through the Hakluyt Society volumes of Lord Amherst of Hackney and Mr. Basil Thomson by the supplying of many ethnological foot-notes and of photographs taken in the islands by the editor.

Studies in Chinese Diplomatic History, by Ching-Lin Hsia, is published in New York by G. E. Stechert.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Adm. G. A. Ballard, *The Maritime Expeditions of Albuquerque after the Capture of Goa* (Mariner's Mirror, July); J. J. Matignon, *La Grande Figure de la Vieille Chine; Li-Houng-tchang*, I., II. (Nouvelle Revue, June 15, July 1).

AFRICA, MEDIEVAL AND MODERN

Under the auspices of the Faculté des Lettres of Algiers, Ch. Cockenpot has made a solid study of *Le Traité Desmichels*, concluded by the general of that name with Abd-el-Kader in the reign of Louis Philippe (Paris, Leroux, 1924, pp. 227).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Claude Faure, *Une Expédition Française en Gambie au Secours des Anglais, 1831* (Revue Historique, July).

AMERICA**GENERAL ITEMS**

The Department of Historical Research in the Carnegie Institution of Washington has finished the reading of galley-proof of vol. I. of the *Correspondence of Andrew Jackson*. The manuscript of vol. II. of Professor C. W. Hackett's *Historical Documents relating to New Mexico, Nueva Vizcaya, etc.*, has been received; that of vol. III. of Dr. Burnett's *Letters of Members of the Continental Congress* has been forwarded for print.

Among recent accessions to the Division of Manuscripts of the Library of Congress are: the papers, not numerous but important, of President Arthur; diaries of William Heth, as a prisoner at Quebec in 1776, and on a journey from Virginia to New York in 1789, and his letter-book as collector of customs in Virginia, 1801; letters of Alexander H. Stephens during and after the Civil War; photostats of the letter-book of John Jay, 1779-1782, and of letters of General Grant to William Wrenshall Smith, 1858-1883. The library has issued a pamphlet list of accessions of manuscripts, broadsides, and British transcripts, for 1924.

Professor A. F. Pollard, of the University of London, delivered this year the lectures in American history provided for on the Sir George Watson Foundation; they are published by the Cambridge University Press, under the title *Factors in American History*.

Professor Ralph V. Harlow has brought out through Messrs. Holt *The Growth of the United States*, designed as a text-book for colleges.

In commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the beginning of Norwegian immigration into the United States the *American-Scandinavian Review* prints a valuable article by Professor L. M. Larson, entitled "A Century of Achievement, 1825-1925", and one by Professor Rasmus B. Anderson on *Restorationen*, the Norse *Mayflower*.

The Augsburg Publishing House of Minneapolis has brought out a *History of the Norwegian People in America*, by Olaf M. Norlie.

The late Louis C. Elson's *History of American Music* has been brought down to 1925 by the addition of four chapters written by Mr. Arthur Elson, son of the author (Macmillan).

Early Baptist Missionaries and Pioneers, by W. S. Stewart, is the first volume of a projected series having the general title *Baptist Missionaries and Pioneers* (Philadelphia, the Judson Press).

ITEMS ARRANGED IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER

The Jesuit Martyrs of North America, by Rev. John J. Wynne, S. J., is an account of the lives of the eight Jesuit martyrs who were beatified June 21 (New York, Universal Knowledge Foundation).

It will perhaps be remembered that in a debate in the Senate, on January 22 last, Senator Borah, debating with Senator Bruce the loans made to the United States by France during the Revolution, and the gifts which the latter stated also to have been made, said: "If there were any gifts of which there has been no settlement, after the most industrious effort I have been unable to find a record of it, and the Treasury Department has been unable to find any record of it, and in my opinion history does not record it." In an address delivered before the Association of History Teachers in the Middle States and Maryland, May 1, now printed

under the title *Our Revolutionary Debt to France*, Professor John H. Latané relates authoritatively the history of the loans, and of the well-known gifts.

Dr. James Hart's extremely elaborated treatise on *The Ordinance-Making Powers of the President of the United States* (*Johns Hopkins Studies*, XLIII. 3, pp. xv, 339) discusses these powers from the points of view successively of analytical jurisprudence, the historical method, constitutional law, political science, and administrative technique, and is of necessity in part historical.

A History of the Cabinet of the United States, from President Washington to President Coolidge, by William Henry Smith, is from the press of the Industrial Printing Company, Baltimore.

Professor Gilbert Chinard of the Johns Hopkins University continues his researches in early Franco-American intellectual contacts by a volume on *Jefferson et les Idéologues; d'après sa Correspondance Inédite avec Destutt de Tracy, Cabanis, J. B. Say, et Aug. Comte* (*Johns Hopkins University*, 1925, pp. 296).

Col. Henry A. Du Pont is the author of a volume entitled *The Campaign of 1864 in the Valley of Virginia and the Expedition to Lynchburg* (New York, National American Society).

The American Indian under Reconstruction: an Omitted Chapter in the Diplomatic History of the Southern Confederacy, by Mrs. Anne H. Abel-Henderson, is from the press of the Arthur H. Clark Company. This is vol. III. of *The Slaveholding Indians*.

Lieut.-Col. O. L. Hein, Civil War veteran and sometime commandant at West Point, has brought out through the firm of Putnam his reminiscences with the title *Memories of Long Ago by an Old Army Officer*.

The Arthur H. Clark Company has published *Forty Years on the Frontier, as seen in the Journals and Reminiscences of Granville Stuart*, in two volumes, edited by Professor Paul C. Phillips of Montana.

The lectures of Professor George H. Blakeslee on the Bennett Foundation of Wesleyan University have been brought out by the Abingdon Press with the title *The Recent Foreign Policy of the United States*.

LOCAL ITEMS ARRANGED IN GEOGRAPHICAL ORDER

NEW ENGLAND

The Maine Historical Society has acquired the diary of General Samuel Leighton, 1822-1848, and a collection of letters, papers, and diaries of Rev. Elijah Kellogg.

The April serial of the *Proceedings* of the Massachusetts Historical Society has an article by Allan Forbes on the Marches and Camp Sites

of the French Army in New England during the Revolutionary War, and several letters from and to Horatio Woodman, written during the Civil War; but the main contribution (53 pp.) is a memoir of the late president, Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, by Charles G. Washburn, a memoir laudatory and defensive, but to be valued by reason of the author's position of close friendship with that statesman. The Society has in preparation, beside the current volume of *Proceedings* and the seventh volume of its reprint of the *Journals of the House of Representatives*, the first volume of its extended edition of the *Winthrop Papers* (this volume running to 1627) and a volume of the *Correspondence of William Hickling Prescott*, edited by Roger Wolcott.

A History of Lawrence, Massachusetts, with War Records, by Maurice B. Dorgan, is offered at Lawrence by the author.

The History of Nantucket County, Island, and Town, including Genealogies of First Settlers, by Alexander Starbuck, has been brought out in Boston by C. E. Goodspeed and Company.

MIDDLE COLONIES AND STATES

In the July number of the New York Historical Society *Quarterly Bulletin* is an article by Sarah H. J. Simpson entitled the Federal Procession in the City of New York, being an account of the procession in 1788 in celebration of the adoption of the Constitution.

The July *Bulletin* of the New York Public Library publishes, with elaborate apparatus, four letters written in 1857-1859 by Lord Macaulay to Henry S. Randall, in which the writer gives his views as to the character and future of American democracy.

The Minutes of the Court of Sessions (1657-1696), Westchester County, New York, edited by Professor Dixon R. Fox, with an essay by G. B. Harrington, is vol. II. of the *Publications* of the Westchester County Historical Society. The minutes, so far as extant, are possessed by that society and the New York Historical Society. Mr. Harrington's essay, explaining the judicial organization and technical procedure, forms a useful introduction to the minutes.

The principal articles in the July number of the *Proceedings* of the New Jersey Historical Society are: Some Early New Jersey Place Names, by Cornelius C. Vermeule; the Early Palatine Immigrations, by A. Van Doren Honeyman; the First Railroad in New Jersey, by Miss Anna M. Brakeley; and the Final Century of Wampum Industry in Bergen County, by Mrs. Frances A. Westervelt.

The principal contents of the July number of the *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* are: a paper by Professor Asa E. Martin on the Temperance Movement in Pennsylvania prior to the Civil War;

an account, by Mr. Charles F. Jenkins, of the Completed Sets of the Signers of the Declaration of Independence; the address of Mr. Franklin S. Edmonds at the Penn Charter Presentation, Harrisburg, March 25; and a continuation of the paper by Edwin J. Sellers concerning the Parentage of Major John Fenwick.

Pennsylvania State College has brought out, in its series of *Studies in History and Political Science*, a volume on *Pennsylvania Place Names*, by Professor Abraham H. Espenshade.

The *Life of William Savery of Philadelphia, 1750-1804* (Macmillan), by Francis R. Taylor, records the career of a Quaker who was "minister, business man, traveller, observer, and missionary".

The principal contents of the July number of the *Western Pennsylvania Historical Magazine* are: General Lafayette's Visit to Pittsburgh in 1825, by Charles W. Dahlinger; Simon Girty and Some of his Contemporaries, by T. L. Rodgers; Origin of the Names given to the Counties in Pennsylvania, by James McKirdy; and a paper concerning David Bruce, Federalist Poet of Western Pennsylvania, by Harry R. Warfel.

SOUTHERN COLONIES AND STATES

The June number of the *Maryland Historical Magazine* contains Some Papers of Robert Smith, Secretary of the Navy, 1801-1809, and of State, 1809-1811, edited by Dr. Bernard C. Steiner, and a number of hitherto unpublished letters, including two (1815, 1816) from Madame Bonaparte (Elizabeth Patterson), three (1814-1817) from Timothy Pickering, two (1823) from Andrew Jackson, one (1829) from James Monroe, and one (August 13, 1863) from Gen. R. B. Ayres.

The Virginia State Library, having completed the publication of the *Journals of the House of Burgesses*, of the *Legislative Journals* of the council of colonial Virginia, and of the *Minutes of the Council and General Court* of the same period, is now engaged in printing the *Executive Journals* of the council. The first volume, less sumptuous in form than those of the preceding series, but prepared with equal care, is now going through the press. The Library is also beginning the publication of a series of letter-books of the governors of Virginia, beginning with Patrick Henry and coming down probably to the Civil War.

The July number of the *Virginia Magazine of History* presents a second installment of Mr. Fairfax Harrison's scholarly account of the Culpeper Proprietors of the Northern Neck, with interesting illustrations; some council journals of 1725, and other continuations.

The July number of the *William and Mary College Quarterly Historical Magazine* brings to a conclusion the series of letters from the Rev. James Madison, president of William and Mary College, to Thomas Jef-

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXXI.—14.

erson, and includes a paper by Isaac S. Harrell on Some Neglected Phases of the Revolution in Virginia. There is also some material pertaining to the Baptists in Middlesex in 1771, contributed by Dr. Garnett Ryland, secretary of the Virginia Baptist Historical Society.

The main item in the July number of *Tyler's Quarterly Historical and Genealogical Magazine* is a long letter of Timothy Pickering, written in 1824, giving his opinion of Washington's military talents, conduct, and character—the jay's view of the eagle.

The Story of Winchester in Virginia: the Oldest Town in the Shenandoah Valley, by Frederic Morton, comes from the press of the Shenandoah Publishing House, Strasburg, Va.

The Rappahannock Indians of Virginia, by Frank G. Speck, appears among the *Indian Notes and Monographs* of the Museum of the American Indian.

The North Carolina Historical Commission issued in August the *Papers of John Steele*, in two volumes, edited by H. M. Wagstaff. It will issue in the fall the first volume of *Calendars of Collections*, and the second volume of *Records of the Moravians in North Carolina*.

The July number of the *North Carolina Historical Review* contains an article by P. M. Hamer on Anglo-French Rivalry in the Cherokee Country; one by R. H. Taylor on Humanizing the Slave Code of North Carolina; the second installment of the Prison Experiences of Randolph Shotwell (those at Fort Delaware), contributed by J. G. deR. Hamilton; and (in the series of North Carolina Tracts of the Eighteenth Century) John Rutherford's *The Importance of the Colonies to Great Britain* (London, 1761).

The History of Christ Church Parish, Macon, Georgia, 1825-1925, compiled by Oliver J. Hart, is published in Macon by Lyon, Harris, and Brooks.

The July number of the Florida Historical Society *Quarterly* includes a paper by Dr. W. E. Dunn on the Occupation of Pensacola Bay, 1689-1698; one by Dr. A. H. Phinney on Florida's Spanish Missions; an account, by Carl Bohnenberger, of the Settlement of Charlottia (Rolles Town), 1765; a continuation of the materials concerning Jacksonville and the Seminole War; and a first installment of reports, letters, etc., of George I. F. Clarke, engineer for the British government during its possession of Florida, who continued the work of land surveying through the Spanish period and for many years after the acquisition of Florida by the United States. These materials are contributed, with an introduction, by C. Seton Fleming.

The April, 1924, number of the *Louisiana Historical Quarterly* (published in May, 1925) is mainly occupied with a valuable doctoral disserta-

tion by Professor V. Alton Moody of Albion College, Michigan, upon Slavery on Louisiana Plantations. There is also a brief history of the Tchoupitoulas plantation by Mrs. M. C. Soniat of the family who have possessed that plantation since 1808, and a history of the parish of St. Jean Baptiste by L. F. Laurent. A section of records of the Superior Council of Louisiana, for 1739, is also presented. To the July number (published in June, 1925) the editor, Mr. Henry P. Dart, contributes an account of the smuggler *St. Michel*, confiscated by the Superior Council of Louisiana in 1729, with the original French documents in the case and an English translation. Another documentary contribution is Pages from a (fragmentary) Journal of a Voyage down the Mississippi to New Orleans in 1817, edited by Felix Flugel. The author of the journal was J. G. Flügel, who came from Germany to the United States in 1803 and was for several years engaged in the Mississippi trade. Among the other contents of this number of the *Quarterly* are an article by W. O. Hart on Flag Legislation in Louisiana, and Mayor Charles M. Waterman's defense of his conduct in the municipal election of 1858, with an introduction by F. P. Burns.

WESTERN STATES

Articles in the June number of the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* are: the Railroad Background of the Kansas-Nebraska Act, by Professor Frank H. Hodder; Projects for Colonization in the South, 1684-1732, by Verner W. Crane; Western Aims in the War of 1812, by Julius W. Pratt; and State Rights and the Union Army, by Fred A. Shannon. The Document in this number of the *Review* is an installment of the Journal of the Expedition of U. S. Dragoons from Fort Leavenworth to the Mexican Boundary on the Road to Santa Fé (May 27-July 21, 1843), under the command of Capt. Philip St. George Cooke. The Journal is edited by William E. Connelley.

The January number of the *Ohio Archaeological and Historical Quarterly* contains a biographical sketch of the late Governor James E. Campbell, by C. B. Galbreath, together with some recent addresses of Governor Campbell; a reprint of a pamphlet of 1825 entitled *Commencement of the Ohio Canal at Licking Summit*, which includes an oration by Senator Thomas Ewing; and an address by W. D. McKinney on Simon Kenton and Thomas W. Cridland, Pioneers. The April number contains three articles by Mr. Galbreath, namely, Tecumseh and his Descendants, Thomas Jefferson's Views on Slavery, and Ohio's Fugitive Slave Law; and one by V. C. Stump on Early Newspapers of Cincinnati.

The *Indiana Magazine of History* devotes a double number (June and September) to a monograph on the Big Four Railroad in Indiana, by Ared M. Murphy.

In the January number of the *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society* Professor Laurence M. Larson has an interesting study on the Changing West, Mr. Edward L. Burchard writes of Early Indian Trails and Tides of Travel in the Lead Mine and Black Hawk Country, A. T. Strange has a biographical sketch of John Tillson, a prominent Illinois pioneer, and W. R. Sandham one of Capt. David Dewolf, a California goldseeker in 1849 and an officer from Illinois in the Civil War.

The *Illinois Catholic Historical Review* has articles on Illinois' First Citizen, Pierre Gibault, by Joseph J. Thompson; a reprint of Mr. Young E. Allison's *The Curious Legend of Louis Philippe in Kentucky*, previously mentioned in these pages, with a postscript dealing with subsequent discussions of that paper; and a paper by Father Eugene Hagedorn, O.F.M., on the Expulsion of the Franciscans from Prussia and their Coming to the United States in the summer of 1875.

The *Tennessee Historical Magazine* for July, 1924, contains an address, by Hon. Park Marshall, on Judge Thomas Stuart (1762-1838); an article by Dr. Charles Lining on the Cruise of the Confederate Steamship *Shenandoah*; one by Kate White on John Adair, the Entry Taker; one by Dr. Samuel C. Williams entitled the First Volunteer from the "Volunteer State"; and a reprint, from the *Proceedings* of the Massachusetts Historical Society, of Professor John S. Bassett's Notes on Jackson's Visit to New England, June, 1833.

The Michigan Historical Commission has begun an important and useful work by the issue of volume I. of a series of volumes of the *Messages of the Governors of Michigan*, edited by the secretary of the commission, Dr. George N. Fuller. This first volume (pp. 527) embraces the messages of Governors Lewis Cass, George B. Porter, Stevens T. Mason, William Woodbridge, and John S. Barry (1824-1841).

The July number of the *Michigan History Magazine* includes an article by Arnold Muller, the Romance of Western Michigan; one by Thomas Conlin on the Original Cloverland Trail; the second of Mr. H. M. Cordell's articles (illustrated) concerning the Ford Historical Collection at Dearborn; some Reminiscences of Copper Harbor, by Anne B. Gray; and Reminiscences of Isle Royale, by W. P. Scott.

The June number of the *Wisconsin Magazine of History* contains an article by Dr. Joseph Schafer entitled a Yankee Land Speculator in Wisconsin (Henry Hubbard), and an account, by Ferdinand F. Doubrava, of the Experiences of a Bohemian Emigrant Family. The documents are a Trip through Wisconsin in 1838, by Bishop Jackson Kemper, and the autobiography of Charles M. Baker, a pioneer. There is also some account by the editor, Dr. Schafer, of a collection of newspapers (58 volumes) published in Kenosha (and its predecessor, Southport) between 1840 and 1877, a recent acquisition of the State Historical Society.

The Minnesota Historical Society has received a great accession by obtaining, after the closing of the federal land offices at Duluth and Crookston on April 1, the records of the United States Land Office for Minnesota, 514 bound volumes and nearly 300 boxes of loose papers; also typed copies of 25 letters written to the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions by missionaries in Minnesota, 1834-1837; more than a hundred Civil War letters written by Charles E. Goddard of the First Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and various papers of business firms.

Minnesota History has in the June issue an article by Theodore C. Blegen on the Norwegian Government and the Early Norwegian Emigration; a translation, with an introduction by Mr. Blegen, of Peter Testman's account of his experiences in North America (*Kort Beskrivelse over de vigtigste Erfaringer under et Ophold i Nord-Amerika*, etc., Stavanger, 1839); an article by C. B. Kuhlman on the Influence of the Minneapolis Flour Mills upon the Economic Development of Minnesota and the Northwest; and Captain Marryat's account of his visit to Minnesota in 1838 (taken from his *Diary in America*).

The July number of the *Iowa Journal of History and Politics* contains an article by Charles R. Keyes on the Progress of the Archaeological Survey of Iowa, and two by Carl H. Erbe, the one on the Executive Department of Government as provided by the Constitution of Iowa, the other a similar study of the judicial department.

The principal content of the January number of the *Annals of Iowa* is a reprint of Plumbé's *Sketches of Iowa and Wisconsin* (St. Louis, 1839), which extends into the April number. The latter issue includes also an account of the proceedings of the Pioneer Lawmaker's Association of Iowa at Des Moines in February, incorporating a number of addresses of an historical or biographical character. The July number contains the uncompleted autobiography of William H. Fleming (1833-1923), who held a number of offices in the state during his life and in particular was private secretary to successive governors of Iowa from 1869 to 1882, and again from 1896 to 1902. The July number contains also some correspondence concerning the Palmetto Flag, taken from the state house in Columbia, South Carolina, in 1865.

The June number of the *Palimpsest* contains an account, by Bruce E. Mahan, of the services of the 51st Iowa Regiment in the Spanish-American War. The July number includes an account of a journey made by Edward L. Peckham from Providence, Rhode Island, across Iowa in June, 1857. That of August is devoted to contributions upon the life and public services of the late Senator William B. Allison. They are by Vernon Cooper, Erik M. Eriksson, and George F. Robeson.

Professor U. B. Phillips, of Michigan, is editing a large group of Florida plantation records for the Missouri Historical Society. The Plumer papers, edited for the society by Professor Everett S. Brown, and the Frederick Bates papers, edited by Professor Thomas M. Marshall, are ready for the press. From the Hugh Washington estate the society obtains a permanent endowment of \$27,000, the income of which is to be expended for books in American history.

The July number of the *Missouri Historical Review* contains an illustrated article by Sarah Guitar on Monuments and Memorials in Missouri; a brief account, by Walter B. Stevens, of the Home Coming of Shelby's Men; a biographical sketch of Charles V. Riley, Benefactor of Agriculture, by Floyd G. Summers; some Recollections of the Civil War, by John H. Frick; and the tenth of Mr. Stevens's studies of the New Journalism in Missouri.

The contents of the *Southwestern Historical Quarterly*, July number, include Some Details of the Southern Overland Mail, by R. N. Richardson; the Diary of C. C. Cox, recording the events of an overland trip from Texas to California in 1849, edited by Mabelle E. Martin; an account of the City of Kent, by Dorothy W. Renick; and the continuations hitherto mentioned.

The June number of the *Chronicles of Oklahoma* includes an article by Grant Foreman on Early Trails through Oklahoma; one by J. J. Dunn on Pioneers and Pioneering in Woods County; the journal of the adjourned session of the first general council of the Indian Territory, Dec. 6-20, 1870; and selections from the Diary of the Rev. Cyrus Kingsbury, contributed, with an introduction, by W. B. Morrison.

The trustees of Colorado College have been enabled, by generous gifts from Philip B. and Frances C. Stewart of Colorado Springs, to establish the Stewart Commission on Western History, to promote intensive study in that field and to supply funds for publication of results. Professor Archer B. Hulbert has been appointed director of the commission. It is likely that the first publication will be a suitable edition of Fremont's journals. The commission greatly desires to hear of any Fremont material relating to Western exploration.

The April number of the *Colorado Magazine* is devoted to a report on an archaeological reconnaissance in Southwestern Colorado in the summer of 1923, by Frank H. H. Roberts, jr.

Beginning with July the *Quarterly Bulletin* of the Wyoming State Department of History becomes the *Annals of Wyoming*. In this number are found an article by A. W. Haggard on the Freightling Business and one by T. S. Garrett entitled Some Recollections of an Old Freightier.

Pacific History Stories, arranged and retold for use in public schools, by Harr Wagner and Alice R. Power, has been published in San Francisco by the former.

In the July number of the *Washington Historical Quarterly* are found an article by Turner F. Levens entitled When Sheridan was in Oregon; a narrative of Benjamin MacDonald, chiefly relating to the activities of his father, Archibald MacDonald, in the service of the Hudson's Bay Company, recorded and edited by William S. Lewis; and an account of Life at Old Fort Colville, transcribed from the papers of Angus MacDonald and edited by William S. Lewis and Jacob A. Meyers.

Several articles in the June number of the *Oregon Historical Quarterly* pertain to the Verendrye Overland Quest of the Pacific. They are: Review of the Verendrye Expeditions, by Grace Flandreau; Introduction to the Verendrye Journals, by Ralph Budd; translations, by Douglas Brymner and Anne H. Blegen, respectively, of the journal of the Verendrye exploration to the Mandan villages on the Missouri, 1738-1739, and that to the foothills of the Rocky Mountains, 1742-1743. Other contents are: an account of John Lyle and the Lyle Farm, by Julia V. Glen; an article by T. C. Elliott on David Thompson, Pathfinder, and the Columbia River (a revision of that which appeared in vol. XII. of the *Quarterly*); and some chapters (translated by Nellie B. Pipes) from Dufлот de Mofras's *Expédition du Territoire de l'Orégon* (Paris, 1844).

The Bureau of American Ethnology has issued as Bulletin 78, in a stout volume (pp. xviii, 995), a *Handbook of the Indians of California*, by Professor A. L. Kroeber, of the University of California. Mainly occupied with the geography, social institutions, culture, and religions of the tribes, it includes also their history in so far as it is recoverable.

CANADA

The Canadian Historical Association held its third annual meeting in Montreal during three days of May. The Association is reported to be growing at the rate of one hundred or more new members a year. Addresses and papers were read by Dr. Lawrence Burpee, president of the Association, by Professors George M. Wrong of Toronto, Stephen Leacock of McGill, W. N. Sage of the University of British Columbia, R. G. Trotter of Queen's, A. S. Walker of Dalhousie, Principal Oliver of the Theological College of Saskatoon, Mr. Gustave Lanctot of the Dominion Archives, Abbé Victor Tremblay, and others. The occasion was taken for the unveiling of a memorial marking the sites of the ancient Indian town of Hochelaga, of Old Fort Chambly on the Richelieu, and of the seigniorial mill of Boucherville at Mount Bruno. The Hon. Thomas Chapais, of Quebec, was elected president for the coming year, Professor Wrong vice-president, Mr. Marius Barbeau, of Ottawa, secretary-treasurer.

The *Canadian Historical Review* for June has an article by H. J. Pearce, jr., on Problems occasioned by Ministerial Government within the Federal State of Canada; one by Dr. Lennox Mills on the Real Significance of the Nootka Sound Incident; one by A. R. M. Lower of the Board of Historical Publications of Ottawa, on Credit and the Constitutional Act, showing the influence of an objectionable method of payment of exchange upon the formation of that act of 1791; and one by R. G. Trotter on an Early Proposal (by R. J. Uniacke) for the Federation of British North America.

The volume of medical military history by Sir Andrew Macphail entitled *Official History of the Canadian Forces in the Great War, 1914-1919: the Medical Services* (Ottawa, King's Printer) is an interesting and competent but highly critical account of the medical services and the dealings of civilian and military authorities with them.

Mr. P.-G. Roy's *Rapport de l'Archiviste de la Province de Québec pour 1923-1924* (pp. xiv, 426) prints a full-length series of *mémoires* presented to the government at Versailles by M. de Bougainville in 1757 and 1758, and his long "Journal de l'Expédition d'Amérique", March, 1756-November, 1758.

The *Papers and Records*, vol. XII. (1924), of the Ontario Historical Society contains an extended study, by Willis Chipman, of the Life and Times of Major Samuel Holland, Surveyor General, 1764-1801; four contributions by Brig.-Gen. E. A. Cruikshank, namely, a Journey from Montreal to Kingston in 1791 (Patrick Campbell's), the Contest for the Command of Lake Ontario in 1814, the First Session of the Executive Council of Upper Canada held in Kingston, July 8-21, 1792, and an address, delivered July 5, 1923, on the unveiling of a tablet to commemorate this first meeting of the Executive Council; four papers by Justice W. R. Riddell, namely, the First British Courts in Canada, the Criminal Law in Reference to Marriage in Upper Canada, the Bidwell Elections, and a Forgotten Canadian Poet (Bishop Mountain); a sketch of Gilbert Tice, U. E., by Ernest Green; the Work of the American Missionary Association among the Negro Refugees in Canada West, 1848-1864, by Fred Landon; and Pioneer Sketches and Family Reminiscences, by Alexander C. Osborne.

Phenomena presenting interesting analogies to some that are familiar in the United States are treated historically in Mr. W. C. Mackintosh's *Agricultural Co-operation in Canada* (Queen's University Studies, vol. II., pp. 173), and in L. A. Wood's *A History of Farmers' Movements in Canada* (Toronto, Ryerson Press, pp. 372).

AMERICA, SOUTH OF THE UNITED STATES

On September 26, 1859, Juan N. Almonte, being at that time minister in Paris of the Conservative government of Mexico, signed with Don Alejandro Mon, plenipotentiary of the queen of Spain, a treaty regarded by historians with warm disapproval. In no. 13 of the *Archivo Histórico Diplomático Mexicano*, published by the Mexican ministry of foreign relations, Señor Antonio de la Peña y Reyes, of that ministry, presents, with suitable introduction, a considerable body of documents illustrating the history of those negotiations, *El Tratado Mon-Almonte* (pp. xxxiv, 157).

The last year's Cuban *Boletín del Archivo Nacional* (año XXIII.) has for the largest item in its contents a series of documents on the capture and destruction, in 1876, by Cuban revolutionaries led by a Peruvian, of the Spanish steamer *Moctezuma*. There is also a continuation of the "Aguila Negra" papers, and of the "Epistolario de la Revolución de 1895", and a calendar of royal decrees of 1789 and 1790.

Professor Charles E. Chapman of the University of California has in preparation a volume which will probably be entitled *History of the Cuban Republic: a Study in Hispanic-American Politics*.

Apuntaciones sobre las Primeras Misiones Diplomáticas de Colombia, 1809-1830 (Bogotá, Imprenta Nacional, 1924, pp. 637), by Señor Pedro A. Zubieta, is especially to be valued as containing large amounts of original material, quoting at length much diplomatic correspondence and many other political documents.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Ch. de la Roncière, *Une Carte de Christophe Colomb* (*Revue des Questions Historiques*, July); A. Aulard, *La Dette Américaine envers la France*, I., concl. (*Revue de Paris*, May 15, June 1); George D. Harmon, *The Proposed Amendments to the Articles of Confederation*, I. (*South Atlantic Quarterly*, July); Hannah G. Roach, *Sectionalism in Congress, 1870-1890* (*American Political Science Review*, August); John D. Barnhart, *Rainfall and the Populist Party in Nebraska* (*ibid.*); Émile Lauvrière, *Les Jésuites en Acadie* (*Revue de l'Histoire des Colonies Françaises*, XXX. 2); Alfred Vagts, *Kanada in seinen Auswärtigen Angelegenheiten* (*Europäische Gespräche*, May); Emilio Ravignani, *La Constitución [Argentina] de 1819*, I. (*Boletín de Investigaciones Históricas*, no. 21).

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS NUMBER

The Marchesa Ginevra Niccolini di Camugliano is a lady of English birth, residing in Florence.

Professor C. H. Van Tyne is professor of history in the University of Michigan, and author of a well-known volume on *The Causes of the War of Independence*.

Mr. P. H. Buck is a fellow and assistant in Harvard University.

Mr. W. L. Langer is an associate professor of history in Clark University.

Dr. E. C. Burnett is a member of the staff of the Department of Historical Research in the Carnegie Institution of Washington, and editor of its volumes of *Letters of Members of the Continental Congress*.

Dr. J. E. Walmsley, contributor of the documents, is professor of history in the Virginia State Teachers College at Farmville.